LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921
Editor: R. Palme Dutt

★

Labour's Great Debate

R. P. D. on the nuclear arms controversy

The Road to Wapping Steps

by Councillor Solly Kaye

★

Other Articles include

A NEW TOWN'S OLD STORY
by Joe Sack

END THIS HELL IN AFRICA
by Jack Woddis

THE BRINK OF PEACE?
by Ivor Montagu

HANDEL AT HALLE
by Alan Bush

AUGUST · 1959

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ENGLISH WEEK

WHILST '*Rule Britannia*'!—with whatever tactful local variations—greeted itinerant Royalty in Canada and Chicago, this spirited air certainly came into its own in the streets of London this past month. It was sung with force and purpose by hundreds of locked-out printers, when police with their dogs tried to break up mass picketing of the 'black' *T.V. Times*. Three days later, as I witnessed seven of their number being arrested outside Odhams' *Daily Herald*, I heard the demonstrators again lustily singing that 'Britons never, never, never shall be slaves.' (Any music critic passing from the nearby Covent Garden Opera House might truly have described their rendering as 'convincing.') Around the offices of the newspaper whose trading catchphrase is 'The Paper That Cares,' a thousand printers marched, holding banners asking: 'What About Caring for Us'? and shouting: 'A 40-hour week now!' What irony! For the *Daily Herald*, first started life as the militant bulletin of the London Society of Compositors during the first strike of their trade in 1911. The once official organ of the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress has become the captive and daily drudge of the multi-millionaire firm Odhams, second biggest magazine and periodical empire since it swallowed Hulton's (for £1,800,000) and took over the huge Newnes combine (for about £13,000,000). So now Odhams rules over 140 publications, with a weekly circulation of 31,000,000. With strict impartiality, next day the demonstrators visited the vast *Mirror-Pic* group, mocking the *Mirror's* catchphrase with their banner: 'Mirror A.P. "Forward with the People"—What about it?' Here, too, was a new monster empire, since buying the Amalgamated Press and its litter of periodicals (for £18,000,000). When the lockout was hardly three weeks old there came news that the third giant, Kemsleys, with its vast dominion of provincial papers, had come on offer. So any printer with a million or two of dispute money at his disposal could consider making a judicious take-over bid. These three monsters together provide the backbone of the British Master Printers' Federation and of the Newspaper Society. When they answered an overtime ban by refusing to employ except on a day-to-day basis, it led to the stoppage of 1,000 provincial and suburban papers and 4,000 general printing firms, and threw 150,000 men and women out of work. Several hundred small firms early broke away and joined other 'non-Fed.' shops in coming to terms on the 40-hour week and the 10% wage increase. Then there began to be some pointed references to the equal right of giant combines and small print-shops-round-the-corner to starve under bridges. The Minister of Labour delicately hinted that it might be desirable for the machinery of negotiation to be 'more flexible for different parts of a complicated industry.' Great Jove himself, made manifest in *The Times* leader writer, complained (simultaneously) of 'lack of flexibility of their collective bargaining', and pointed out that 'there are different classes of arrangement within the agreement'. It was 'no doubt true, as the unions assert, that some firms can well stand more than they are offering', admitted *The Times*, whilst asserting that smaller firms would be killed off. Well, whoever else mourns the passing of any little ones, we are willing to bet that Odhams, the *Mirror-Pic* and Kemsleys remain dry-eyed, keep a stout heart and a stiff upper lip. For statistics show that the gross profits per man in

(*Continued on page iii of cover*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

LABOUR'S GREAT DEBATE

Labour believes it is undesirable that Britain should be dependent on another country for this vital weapon . . . we support the production of the hydrogen bomb in this country.—*Labour Party National Executive, 1955.*

Communist candidates will challenge and oppose the decision of the Tory and right wing Labour leaders to make the hydrogen bomb, rearm the Nazis and prepare for atomic war.—*Communist Party Election Manifesto, 1955.*

FORTY-five years ago this month the first world war broke out. Twenty years ago next month the second world war broke out. Can we prevent a third world war? Can we prevent the use of the terrible new weapons which carry with them the sentence of incalculable death and destruction for living beings? It is natural that this question should dominate all others in the minds of all today.

It is natural also that the very heart and heat of this world controversy should be centred at this moment in Britain and in the British labour movement, in what is probably the most intense debate in its history. Possibly it might have seemed a trifle puzzling to the founders half a century ago that their party should be engaged half a century onwards in a vehement debate, not about the next steps after the victory of socialism, nor even about the construction of socialism, long abandoned even as an aim, but about the use of weapons calculated to kill and maim hundreds of millions of men, women and children as part of a capitalist alliance against socialism. However, these ironies of history have also their logic. That logic began already

CONTENTS

Vol. XLI AUGUST · 1959

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *Labour's Great Debate,* by R.P.D. ...	321
THE BRINK OF PEACE?, by Ivor Montagu	333
END THIS HELL IN AFRICA, by Jack Woddis	336
THE ROAD TO WAPPING STEPS, by Councillor Solly Kaye ...	340
A NEW TOWN'S OLD, OLD STORY, by Joe Sack	343
THE DOCK STRIKE, 1889	344-5
THE SHOP STEWARD'S JOB, by D. Tocher	348
THE ARAB WORLD AND US, by N. S. Khrushchov	351
THE MORNING AFTER 'THE TONIGHT' BEFORE, by D. H. Calcutt	357
HANDEL AT HALLE, by Alan Bush	360
THE ARTIST'S WORLD OUTLOOK, by N. A. Dobrolyubov ...	363
Book Reviews:	
C'Etait Ainsi, by F. Grenier: *D. N. Pritt, Q.C.*	367
Soviet Medicine: The Fight Against Mental Disease, by L. Rokhlin: *L. Crome*	367

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the decision of 1914 broke the heart of Keir Hardie and hastened his death ; when the first Labour Premier became the agent of the American bankers to impose the Dawes Plan on Europe ; when the ' Iron Chancellor ' of the Second Labour Government was feted by the City for his brilliant success in securing a schedule for a slightly higher percentage of reparations to be paid by the Weimar Republic to Britain in 1984 ; and when the Premier of the third Labour Government sanctioned the dropping of the atom bomb on Hiroshima and the stationing of American atom bombers in Britain. The chain unwinds. It is part of the bedevilment of the present controversy that the question of weapons, which are the outcome and expression of policy, is seen by the innocent in a pure and artificial isolation from the policies of which they are the outcome and whose reversal is essential in order to secure the abolition of these same hideous weapons.

Britain and the World

Britain has been at the centre of both world wars, and indeed of most European wars for the past three centuries. Today Britain is still at the centre, no longer from strength, but from weakness. Britain is no longer the first capitalist power, nor yet—as once might have been within reach —the first socialist power, but weaker than both ; nor any longer the final arbiter of the fate of the world or predestined victor. Instead Britain, under its present rulers, has become the object rather than the subject of policy ; the anvil rather than the hammer ; the main base and the projected victim of a future nuclear war. In the elegant phrase of the Labour Minister, then Financial Secretary to the Admiralty, John Dugdale already in March, 1949 : ' In a future war the Atlantic would become like the Mediterranean in the last war, with England taking the place of Malta.' England as Malta. It is worth noting that this statement was made within eight months of the stationing of the American atom bombers in Britain under the secret agreement between Mr. Attlee and the United States Government in July, 1948, as part of the price of Marshall Aid. It is further worth noting that this agreement, bartering away the future of the people, was originally kept so secret from the Labour Party and the people that even the stationing of the American atom bombers in Britain was at first covered up under casual references to a temporary visit for training purposes only.

Gathering Storm

This elementary truth of the role allotted for Britain in the modern Western nuclear strategy (thus indiscreetly blurted out by a junior Minister who was private secretary to the Labour Premier and whose

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

background had been the diplomatic service) has taken time to sink into popular consciousness during these ten years. It has taken time, because the ugly truth of Britain's allotted role as the pawn for destruction in Western nuclear strategy, has been carefully concealed in most public utterances of the principal Labour or Tory Ministers or church leaders behind soporific phrases about 'the most modern weapons,' 'the means of self-defence,' 'the indispensable instrument of self-preservation,' 'the great deterrent,' and similar pretty labels for the bottle of poison. But as the scale and range has moved with ever swifter and more startling leaps in modern strategic development; as the atom bomb has given place to the hydrogen bomb; as the dreams of nuclear superiority have vanished; as the bombers have become outdated by the rocket missiles; so the horrified awakening to the bankruptcy of the entire Western nuclear strategy has begun to spread among the British people above all. Very wide sections are stirring. Two great demonstrations took place within three months. The Aldermaston March rallied 15,000 to Trafalgar Square on Easter Monday; on June 28 the mighty national 'March For Life' demonstration assembled over 30,000 there under the auspices of the British Peace Committee. With the participation of leaders in every sphere of the national life, this was the biggest demonstration in Britain since the war, and without parallel since the great Second Front demonstrations during the war against fascism. The storm is rising. All the clever formulas in the world will not so easily maintain the worship of this nuclear Moloch, or exorcise the spectre against which the people are marching to end the menace and win peace.

Labour's Battleground

Nor is it surprising that the most tense centre and battleground of this fight for the future of the people should be developing within the mass organisations of the working class, in the conferences of the great trade unions, in preparation for the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference. In proportion as the heat and thrust of real debate, and the sense of great impending decisions has been increasingly removed from parliament under current conditions, and parliament has been transformed into the appearance of an archaic ritual for formalised debating gestures and the registration of pre-determined decisions, so the heat and thrust of genuine impassioned debate and battle between opposing tendencies for the verdict on the great political issues of the day has been transferred to the assizes of the organised working class, to the conferences of the trade unions and co-operative organisations, to the Trades Union Congress and the Labour Party Conference. The keen public attention to the debates of these conferences, and the lively press

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speculation concerning them, as compared to the languid attention to parliamentary debates, has illustrated this significant current trend. A similar symptom of this current—not necessarily permanent—degeneracy of parliament under the dead hand of bipartisanship and an artificially rigid two party regime maintained by an undemocratic electoral system has been the remarkable publicity given of late in the principal press organs to all key trade union elections, far more than to parliamentary by-elections, as a measure of popular support for the representatives of opposing political trends.

A New Document

In the face of this rising storm against existing nuclear policies the Labour Party Executive and Trades Union Congress General Council have combined at the end of June—with somewhat considerable haste in the last stages, just in time before the key conferences of the transport workers, miners and railwaymen—to issue a new document of policy on nuclear weapons. The document is entitled: *Disarmament and Nuclear War: the Next Step*. If all the successive documents, policy statements and pamphlets issued by the Labour Party and Trades Union Congress on nuclear weapons were placed end to end, there is no doubt that they might reach all the way from the bases in East Anglia to Land's End. But the road would be jagged and tortuous; for they are full of contradictions. Each new document contradicts the last. The self-same arguments presented with pontifical authority in one are rejected with no less certainty in the next. Proposals dismissed as 'quite untenable' in one are offered as the latest wisdom in the next.

Statesmanship

Of course it is always possible to reject or revise former views in the light of further experience or new developments. But common honesty and seriousness would require a frank recognition of such changes or repudiations of former arguments rather than to attempt to behave blandly as if they do not exist. Otherwise the impression is inevitably created that we are here faced with—shall we say, in order not to be too unkind?—political agility rather than statesmanship. Even so the new document has failed to paper the cracks. On the Labour Party Executive the opposition of four leading members has been reported, and on the General Council the opposition of no less than eight. The battle is only beginning. Temporary special conditions of printing this (and we take the opportunity to pay tribute to the magnificent solidarity and militant spirit of the printers' fight on behalf of the whole working class) have required the production of this month's issue of our journal in the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first week of July, in advance of the key conferences of the transport workers, the miners and the railwaymen whose decisions will have so important a bearing on the further outcome when the annual sessions of the T.U.C. and of the Labour Party Conference will have the responsibility to define their policy on these urgent questions of nuclear weapons and peace. It would be premature to anticipate the decisions of these conferences, which will be familiar to readers by the time they read this.

The Last Word?

Will the new document prove the last word—the entrenched position from which the right wing leadership give battle in the endeavour to win the widest possible majority in the name of unity before the election? Or, if pressure arises from these impending conferences, may there still be further revisions, concessions, compromises? This is not excluded. The document has been met with sharp criticism from wide and varied sections of the left. It is evident that the dominant leadership are determined to maintain at all costs the essentials of the NATO nuclear strategy, of the senseless and suicidal conception of 'the deterrent.' On the other hand, they have given away so little in the new document, since even the proposal of the hypothetical non-nuclear club is in fact left conditional on the agreement of all the other countries concerned, that they have still left themselves some room for manoeuvre, if necessity arises. They would thus consider, if pressure is strong, some modifications of formula or revisions on detail points, while leaving untouched the essentials of adherence to NATO and the general conception of nuclear strategy. At this stage it would be useless to anticipate the outcome which depends on the battle. But in view of the increasing complexity and variety of the controversy as it has now developed it may be useful to endeavour to summarise very briefly the main policies put forward at the present time. Six main types of policy may be distinguished among the hundred varieties and cross-breeds.

1. Orthodox Nuclear Strategy

This is the official outlook of NATO, the Tory Government and (in essentials) right wing Labour. The essentials are: Support for the conception of the H-bomb as 'the deterrent.' Support for NATO, the American alliance and nuclear strategy. Support for Britain's manufacture and possession of the H-bomb (hypothetically modified in Labour's new document). Support for the American bomber bases and missile sites in Britain. Platonic support for the ideal future aim of an international ban on all nuclear weapons (this is agreed 'in principle' by all, even the most extreme American militarist spokesmen at the United

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nations or fire-eating Tories). In practice every concrete Soviet proposal for such a ban, presented every year since the war, is consistently voted down by the United States and Britain, with official Labour support, on the alternative or concurrent grounds (a) that it would deprive the West of its indispensable weapon to meet Soviet supposed superiority of manpower; or (b) that inspection and control would be inadequate or impossible; or (c) that any ban must be part of a comprehensive disarmament agreement, which must take many, many years to negotiate, while every concrete Soviet proposal for a general disarmament agreement, even incorporating all the Western propositions, is similarly obstructed and voted down. Behind this barrage the Western nuclear strategists feel so far tolerably safe, and in technical papers dilate on the infinite future extension of their nuclear strategy. The main variation of official Labour policy so far (until the new document) on this general bi-partisan line has been the proposition that a Labour Government would unilaterally suspend tests—on which issue there seems to be some favourable prospects of an international agreement as a result of the Geneva negotiations.

2. Hypothetical Non-Nuclear Club

This is the proposition that Britain should offer to renounce manufacture and possession of nuclear weapons on condition that all other countries concerned except the United States and the Soviet Union should agree to do the same. The offer is purely hypothetical and conditional. If de Gaulle or Adenauer or any other Government refuse to accept, the offer falls to the ground, and all remains as before. This is the policy which the new Labour document now advocates. The purely hypothetical and conditional character of the proposal is underlined and triple-locked in the document. Fulfilment would be subject to 'an agreement, preferably under the auspices of the United Nations, signed by every nation with the exception of the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.' The signed agreement must be 'subject to full and effective international controls.' Failing the fulfilment of all these conditions, the old policy continues. But what prospect is there that de Gaulle, for example, who has just announced his intention to explode his first atomic test in the Sahara (in defiance of the justified protest of Ghana and all the African peoples) would listen to such a proposal from a British Labour Government? Certainly the menace of the extension of nuclear weapons to an ever widening array of nations is grave and urgent. But is there not far more practical prospect of checking this by a general international ban than by attempting an invidious discriminatory regulation which could come into conflict with national sentiment?

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

3. Unconditional 'Founder-Membership' of the Non-Nuclear Club

This is a variant of the above proposition to remove its hypothetical and conditional character. It is the proposal that Britain should not wait for the agreement of the other members of the proposed non-nuclear club, but should take the lead in renouncing the manufacture and possession of nuclear weapons as an example, or as a 'founder-member' of the non-nuclear club, and on this basis should approach the other countries concerned, outside the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R., to do the same. Implicit in this conception, as in the previous one, is that Britain should not renounce NATO and its nuclear strategy, but should rely on the 'protection' (!) of the American atom bombers, rocket sites and nuclear weapons. This proposal is in effect a special form of partial unilateralism.

4. Partial Unilateralism

This is the policy officially put forward by the Liberal Party. Indeed, the Liberals have welcomed the belated 'conversion' of the Labour Party's new document, as they claim, to their policy; 'the conversion is most welcome,' *(Manchester Guardian,* June 25, 1959). The Liberals propose that Britain should abandon the manufacture or possession of the H-bomb or nuclear weapons, not as a renunciation of NATO nuclear strategy, but as a practical economic and strategic measure of co-ordinated Atlantic strategy, in order to concentrate the use of the expensive 'deterrent' in the hands of the United States, while the British armed forces should be used for protecting the American bomber and missile sites, following up as ground forces an American nuclear attack, or for colonial wars and similar conventional functions. Needless to say, this policy would offer Britain no protection from nuclear destruction, but would leave Britain completely exposed and vulnerable as the principal American advance base in a nuclear war. This characterisation applies in fact to all the four above policies.

5. Absolute Unilateralism

This is the policy presented in the resolution adopted by the Conference of the General and Municipal Workers, and advocated by the majority of the supporters (not all—some appear to be partial unilateralists, still supporting the American alliance and NATO, and concentrating only on the elimination of the British H-bomb) of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament. This policy proposes 'that the next Labour Government should take unilateral action in ceasing to manufacture nuclear weapons and in prohibiting the use of all such weapons, from British territory,' i.e. not only the abandonment of British nuclear

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weapons, but the removal of the American atom bombers and rocket missile sites from Britain. This is at any rate a consistent policy to end the role of Britain as a nuclear base and to this extent to diminish the extreme menace therefrom arising for the British people. But the fulfilment of this demand would require, as Mr. Bevan and its right-wing opponents clearly understand, basic changes in foreign policy and the end of the whole present set-up and strategy of NATO and the Anglo-American military alliance. These political implications are less clearly understood by many of its supporters. The demand, taken in isolation, is a purely negative policy, and by itself could not eliminate the menace of nuclear war. It requires to be supplemented by a positive fight for a basic change in foreign policy, and specifically for an international ban.

Theory of the 'Moral Gesture'

Many of the most serious and sincere ethical, religious and pacifist supporters of 'absolute unilateralism' believe that the abandonment of the H-bomb by Britain could prove a 'moral gesture' which could 'give a lead' to the Soviet Union and the United States to follow Britain's example. Thereby they believe that they could solve the problem of how to generalise Britain's unilateral action and eliminate from the world the menace of nuclear war. In this view, most genuinely held, is revealed that innocence of political realities which can often defeat the fulfilment of the very aims these sponsors have at heart. They see only an abstract imaginary picture of three nuclear powers, among whom the action of one might persuade the other two. In their simple impartiality they are unaware that the Soviet Union has continuously pressed for the absolute and unqualified banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons, so that there is no problem here once the American and British peoples can induce their governments to take a similar stand. In their strategic innocence they do not realise that the confrontation is not of three rival nuclear powers, but of a Soviet bomb and an Anglo-American bomb, and that of the Anglo-American bomb the British proportion is only 3 per cent. To propose that, if the Anglo-American bomb is reduced by 3 per cent to 97 per cent of its former strength, therefore as a worthy response the Soviet bomb should be reduced by 100 per cent, is obviously less than reasonable and might even be regarded by the unkind as sharp practice. There is, in short, no magical short-cut to escape the necessity of political action in order to win an international ban as the only means of preventing nuclear war. But it is precisely here that Britain can play, not merely a negative role of abstention, but a highly positive role. This brings us to the sixth policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6. A Consistent Policy Against Nuclear Strategy and For Peace

This is the policy which has been put forward by the Communist Party and wide sections of the left. This policy has this much in common with the unilateralists that it does demand (and has always demanded from the outset long before the formation of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament and other bodies has fortunately helped to swell the support for this particular limited demand) the cessation of the manufacture and possession of nuclear weapons by British and the removal of the atom bomber and rocket sites from Britain. But it has never presented this demand as the solution to the problem of nuclear war. It has presented this demand, not as a ' moral gesture ' or ' example ' to other nations, but as a practical common-sense measure in the national interest of the British people, because these atom bombers and rocket sites are a menace to the survival of the people, and the Government's nuclear military programme is ruinously straining our economic resources and throwing away the chances of peaceful nuclear economic development. But the fight against the menace of nuclear war requires a political fight for a basic change of Britain's policy ; for an end to the nuclear strategy of NATO and the cold war and the nuclear rearmament of West Germany ; for peaceful co-existence ; and above all, to ensure that the British Government stands firmly beside the Soviet Government and the universal demand of all the peoples of the world, thereby isolating and compelling the acquiescence of the militarists in the United States, in order to impose an unqualified international agreement for the banning and destruction of all nuclear weapons. The fight against nuclear weapons is bound up with the wider fight for peace.

Worst of all Possible Worlds

In the light of this analysis what are we to say of the Labour Party's new document ? It would be unjust to say that it represents the worst of the six policies enumerated above, since in reality it succeeds in mating the features of the two worst in such a way as to produce a still more revolting progeny. It seeks to maintain the first policy (the orthodox nuclear strategy of NATO) under cover of proposing the second (the offer of a hypothetical non-nuclear club). The hypothetical offer is so weighed down with limiting conditions that its sponsors can have every confidence that there is no likelihood of the conditions being fulfilled ; the I.O.U. will never fall due to be paid. But under cover of the grand concession to the wolves (or left critics) expressed in this hypothetical offer, the old policy is in practice maintained. Thus we have here something in the nature of an all too transparent confidence trick.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Slipping in the Joker

This peculiar character, which recalls something of the highest dexterity of palming the pea from under the thimble while the yokel is not looking, is further borne out by the remarkable fact that, while all attention is focussed on the dazzling new offer of the hypothetical non-nuclear club, certain significant retreats in foreign policy are slipped into other sections. Thus on disengagement in Europe the old policy of 'gradual withdrawal under effective control of foreign forces of all kinds' from the countries suggested (four socialist countries and one NATO country) is now replaced in the new statement which makes the first step 'effective international control over arms and armed forces' in these five countries, with any question of withdrawal delayed until after this. In the same way the declaration of the Scarborough Conference last year against the construction of the new rocket sites until a Summit Conference, as it was then understood, has been abandoned. Nor are these the only examples of a real retrogression under a show of concession to the left. But let us even suppose that the hypothetical non-nuclear club is to be regarded as a serious proposition intended to be fulfilled, and not as a temporary expedient to appease the critics. Let us even imagine it fulfilled. What follows ? In that case Britain, in the view of Mr. Gaitskell and Mr. Bevan, is to be made dependent on the American H bomb, since the adherence to the theory of the 'deterrent' and the nuclear strategy of NATO is not only maintained, but even emphasised more than ever in the new document. Yet this is precisely the position against which the entire right wing Labour leadership and the Labour Party Executive directed its fire until last year.

> I do not believe it right that this country should be absolutely dependent on the United States. That is one good reason for going ahead with our work on the atomic bomb. (Mr. Attlee, in 1952)

The Labour Party Executive in 1955 declared that Britain must manufacture the H-bomb because 'Labour believes it is undesirable that Britain should be dependent on another country for this vital weapon.' Oddly enough, the new document fails to quote or attempt to answer the arguments of the previous document.

'Nauseating Hypocrisy'

Most rewarding at the present moment, in preparation for the discussions at the coming Labour Party Conference, is last year's pamphlet published by the Labour Party on the H-bomb, the famous pamphlet by Mr. Strachey, with an approving foreword by Mr. Gaitskell. In this pamphlet Mr. Strachey used all his persuasive powers, which have always so brilliantly presented the arguments for so many different cases

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in succession, to prove that Britain must manufacture and possess the H-bomb because otherwise Britain without her own H-bomb would be 'wholly dependent on American protection,' 'would lose her power to influence events in general' and 'it would be criminal to throw that influence away.' Strong words ('criminal') to describe the present Labour Party document. Under the title *The Half-way House Case* an illuminating section tears to pieces the conception of the non-nuclear club that Britain should depend on the American nuclear weapons.

> It would be a really nauseating piece of hypocrisy to protest that we were too holy to possess H-bombs ourselves, while all the time saying under our breath that anyhow we didn't need them because the American H-bombs would always protect us.

And again on the proposal that the nuclear weapons of the Western alliance should be concentrated in American hands (i.e. the proposal of the new document):

> There would always be a feeling of utter dependence upon an ally which alone had the decisive weapons. We must ask again whether such complete dependence upon America really is a position which we would desire for a Labour Government. It would be bound to hamper a Labour Foreign Secretary.

It is not recorded that either Mr. Gaitskell or Mr. Strachey voted against the new document.

Mr. Cousins' Three Points

Preliminary, possibly inspired, press reports have suggested that Mr. Cousins and others associated with him among those who voted on the General Council in opposition to the document have been considering the possibility of amending it on three specific points. First, an undertaking to stop tests unilaterally without qualification. Second, a declaration by a Labour Government that it will not use the bomb first (the present official NATO strategy is to use it first even though it is not used by the other side). Third, to stop the manufacture of the bomb as a prelude to disarmament talks. By the time these lines appear, the results of the Transport Workers' Conference will have indicated whether these points are in fact being proposed or supported by the union. If these points are being presented, it is evident that they are being put forward as a serious attempt to find a provisional compromise basis such as in the present stage of the controversy could win the widest measure of united support for the amendment of the document and achieve significant advance. The need is for co-operation of all, however varied in outlook, however much differing on other questions, who are opposed to nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy. Differences in outlook are

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inevitable, but these differences should not prevent co-operation. Divisions only play into the hands of the main enemy, the representatives of the NATO nuclear strategy and its supporters in the labour movement. Consistent opponents of nuclear strategy, at the same time as presenting their total programme for peace and the elimination of nuclear war, will co-operate with every section engaged against nuclear weapons and strategy.

Unity for Victory

We may have differences of outlook with many of those who call themselves unilateralists ; but they are against the bomb, on however limited a front ; therefore we are friends and allies in this fight. We may find inadequate and far short of what we would like to see the limited points which it has been suggested may be taken up by influential sections of the opposition within the trade union movement to the new official document of the Labour Executive and General Council in order to amend that document. But if in practice the line of fight between the opponents and official supporters of nuclear strategy within the trade union and labour movement develops at this stage around these issues, then this becomes the immediate line of fight into which the fullest strength needs to be thrown. At the same time, alongside this active co-operation in every immediate phase of the fight, it is essential to present and win support for the full alternative programme for a new orientation of Britain's policy, away from the cold war and nuclear strategy, towards peaceful co-existence, the international banning of nuclear weapons, and co-operation with the new world that is arising. Only in this way will we build up the extending unity of all sections of the people in the battle against nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy. Only in this way will we help to build up the unity of all the peoples of the world which can alone bring to fulfilment the inspiring words of Mao Tse Tung a decade ago :

> In the end of ends it is not the bomb that will destroy the people, but the people who will destroy the bomb.

July 7, 1959 R.P.D.

POSTSCRIPT. Since going to press, the resolution of the Transport and General Workers' Union conference on nuclear weapons and disarmament has been published. This goes far beyond the three points, and offers a significant challenge to official nuclear strategy. It is evident that this resolution provides a platform for united support of all sections opposed to nuclear weapons and nuclear strategy, and that if majority support could be won for this resolution, such a victory would represent a giant step forward for the whole Labour movement in the fight.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE BRINK OF PEACE?

Ivor Montagu

WARS often start in the summer. The 1914 war, the Spanish war, Hitler's war, the attack upon U.S.S.R., the Korean war—examples spring readily to mind. Optimism based on presumed military-technical seasonal advantages is obviously mixed up in the matter. The aggressor always expects to 'get to somewhere-or-other by Christmas' and not have to buy woollen underclothing for his P.B.I.s. The fact that in each case history disappoints him never seems to discourage his successor.

But there is another way in which summer is dangerous for the cause of peace. The peacemongers are apt to be on holiday. Vigilance is relaxed. Mass pressure is reduced. It would be particularly calamitous if this were to happen this year, and unaccustomed and delightful sunshine be allowed to induce the inhabitants of the (more populous) northern hemisphere to forget their troubles as they pack the children's buckets and spades. For we seem approaching the brink of peace. Dulles taught us to grow accustomed to brinks, but this is a new one. World anxiety, world pressure, world determination has dragged the statesmen to its edge. Now we are so nigh we must not relax but push them over—or all may be to do again!

In what does this brink consist? It consists of three agreements, each of which has now come near enough to realisation to be a practical, immediate possibility in the diplomatic field. What are these three? The summit meeting, stopping tests and disengagement. In themselves, maybe, they are not everything. In themselves they are not yet disarmament, the abolition of nuclear weapons, the whole settlement of the German question, the end of intervention against China, the complete finish of the cold war. But they would constitute the turning point, the point at which the war drive becomes reversed, the point from which begins the thaw.

Why is the summit meeting important? Does peace lie solely in the hands of magic old gentlemen, sitting round a table? Would the mistrust and malice manifested at Foreign Minister level vanish beneath the geniality of their Prime Minister's smiles? This is not how the thing would work. Of course not. But, once met, it would be hard for the latter to separate and disappoint their peoples, without achieving what their peoples await of them. Fierce is the light that beats upon a summit. It is harder to suppress or distort the facts, clearly outlined against the glow, when you are meeting at the top. It is not so easy to break, for frivolous

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

reasons, and get away with it before your electorate. That is why those who are not eager for settlement fear the top of the mountain as the devil fears holy water and why they have to be dragged there inch by inch. Public opinion has them nearly there. We must not relax our grip and let them get away.

Ending nuclear weapons tests forever is becoming increasingly difficult to refuse. Witness the wriggles of the Pentagon and its desperate straits to devise novel and even half-plausible excuses for evasion and delay. Witness the embarrassment of Nye Bevan at being caught hedging on his assurances respecting the intentions of the next Labour government. If there is one thing the world's heart is set upon it is that such tests should never start again. And the instinct of the world is right. Get this, and you are on the way to all. Certainly, stocks would not be eliminated, nor even manufacture immediately halted, by simple agreement to stop tests. But —stop tests and you stop the race. Of what good to invent or seek for new and greater horrors if you cannot find out how they work ? End the race, and you end with it the hope of militarily-technically surpassing your neighbour, and so the whole perspective and political logic of the policy of force. Stopping tests would stop the gradual poisoning of the world, and everything which thereon is, no small thing in itself, but even this is not the most important. It would interrupt the competition. It would set up necessarily co-operating international control posts. It would reverse the whole trend. Its success would hearten the peoples of the world. They would know unmistakeably that they *can* force peaceful measures, even over the live bodies of the generals and diplomats. It would answer the oft-posed question of the passive : ' Of course I want peace, but what good is anything done by little me?' by a shining proof and so win thousands to the active ranks of vocal peace-demanders. ' The appetite grows in eating,' and these ranks would soon advance beyond this first success.

The third vital step our feet are nearing is disengagement, any sort, any measure. It almost matters little where or how limited, for a start. The Eden plan, the Rapacki plan, the Mitchell plan, the Kennan plan, the Macmillan planlet of a few miles wide, or even the tiny little breath of a plan, sniff of a plan, contained in the Western Foreign Ministers package deal offer (stinking dead, as a bundle, even before it was strung up)—i.e., not to eliminate certain weapons, not to reduce certain troops, but just to control the present forces' ceilings in a tiny area—all these have this in common ; *they make a start.* Once any, whichever, is in operation, works and is to be seen in working order, proving that control *can* be operated, how long do you think before the peoples' demand grows inexorable for more ? Gain a non-nuclear zone in Central Europe,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how long before the people of the Balkans, the Baltic and the Pacific, the people of Britain for that matter, start seeking a like privilege, raise a clamour likewise to be counted 'out'?

From small beginnings great achievements flow. How near we are to such small beginnings may be assessed by the fact that, in our country, for example, not one mass organisation, not one political party, not one general even, no one, dares declare itself against them. Certainly many who pay lip-service are false friends. But the only way to distinguish true from dross is by mass pressure, by actively demanding action and yielding short shrift to those who hesitate. Now we are so near, don't let us be cheated at the last. Summit tests, disengagement—those are the menu of the meal already in the kitchen. Don't let us be led astray by squabbles over mirages however delectable that can only be reached as a next stage and still lie, in reality, beyond the desert horizon. And don't let us let up. Don't go away on holiday, they say, without ordering your favourite paper. Don't go away and forget to order peace.

LABOUR MONTHLY TWENTY-FIVE YEARS AGO

A PEACE PARTY

War has sometimes been prevented under Capitalism and Imperialism: but both systems add greatly to the risk of war, and the difficulty of establishing peace. War cannot involve Britain without Britain's consent. United Labour could prevent Britain taking part in any war. If 'Trade' is to be the deciding factor, a war bringing temporary profit to Trade Unionism is conceivable. But it would be none the less damnable, or eventually disastrous, for that reason. The Soviet Union has put forward various Peace proposals—all better than our own. I support most its first proposal for total disarmament... I believe that Labour would have more power in this country to prevent war, and force the government to a real peace policy by declaring itself a definite Peace-Party (even to the extent of law-breaking). It might return fewer members to Parliament: but even if it returned none it would become a real power: and nothing would so hasten Socialism's day of power as the prevention of War. I would make refusal to vote for armaments a first plank in the Labour Platform. I joined the Labour Party because of the I.L.P's attitude towards war, in 1920. I shall cease to be an active member of the Labour Party if War is officially approved at the forthcoming Conference.

(Laurence Housman, replying to *A Questionnaire on War*, August, 1934)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

END THIS HELL IN AFRICA

Jack Woddis

LABOUR Party policy on Central Africa is now in the forefront of political issues. The Tory leaders are engaged in wooing Hugh Gaitskell and the other Labour leaders to accept a bi-partisan standpoint on Central African Federation. By this means they hope to take Federation out of the realms of party politics—and so dash the hopes of the African people who have been looking for the return of a Labour Government to bring about a change of policy. It is therefore timely to examine the whole matter of Federation and why the Africans oppose it.

It is fashionable nowadays—and indeed, essential, in view of the existing spotlight on Central Africa—for the supporters of Federation to claim that Federation has brought great benefits to the African people. This is a claim whose falsity is easily exposed. But it is just as well to recall what were the main arguments used before Federation was set up, when the average man in the street in Britain was not so concerned, and when the Welenskys felt no obligation to conceal their real motives.

Interviewed by the Bulawayo *Chronicle* on September 6, 1951, Welensky stated that during his European tour he had been 'tremendously impressed by the interest of bankers and industrialists . . . in the political future of Central Africa.' They had told him, 'If you get Federation it means stability and if you get political stability we are interested in "your" country.' Clear enough? American financial interests, too, showed great interest in Federation right from the start, and increasingly poured dollars into Central Africa as the foundation of the Federation drew near. W. L. Batt, of the E.C.A. Mission to the United Kingdom (Marshall Plan), announcing £5 million for Rhodesia, added that America would

> be repaid to the fullest extent possible in raw materials in which the United States is deficient, such as cobalt, copper, tungsten and chrome.
>
> (Bulawayo *Chronicle*, July 6, 1951)

Nor was the military aspect overlooked. Central Africa's part in military plans was fully discussed at the Commonwealth Defence Conference in London, June, 1951. To quote the same source:

> We see in this Conference Rhodesia's introduction as a cog in the vast machinery of defence preparations linked with the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation. (June 20, 1951)

No wonder *The Times*, on November 22, 1951, referred to the projected Federation as 'an imperial issue.' The London weekly *East Africa and Rhodesia* confidently predicted that

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> given Federation, hundreds of millions of pounds would . . . become available from British and American sources.
>
> (June 26, 1952)

Thus, in the days of the creation of the Federation no pretence was made that this was intended to benefit the Africans. Investments, dollars, minerals, war plans—these were the words bandied about so openly then, and to this day they remain the reality behind the Federation. In fact, Lord Home, Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, speaking recently on the question of investment in Central Africa stated that

> the Federation was the unit most likely to attract such investment.
>
> (*Observer*, April 5, 1959)

Mr. Harry Oppenheimer, whose companies have invested millions in the Federation, including a new £3½ million factory, declared

> My faith in the economic future of the Federation is not only as great as ever before—it is greater than ever before.
>
> (*Federation Newsletter*, May 8, 1959)

When big industrialists have faith, it is time for the workers to watch out.

For the African people, too, it was no less clear, right from the start what Federation was intended to achieve. There is no space to detail here their long, firm battle of resistance from even before the African representatives' rejection of the Federation proposals at the abortive Victoria Falls Conference in September, 1951, right down to the present day. The record is there for all to see, no less than in the present crisis. Suffice it to quote the words of one African speaker at a mass meeting in N'dola, on the Northern Rhodesian Copper Belt, in 1953.

> In rejecting Federation with Southern Rhodesia we are not choosing between heaven and hell. Northern Rhodesia is also hell, but the door out of the Federation hell will be more tightly bolted than the door out of the present hell.

What a clear understanding of the issue is conveyed in these words, and what a welcome corrective to certain Labour leaders' conception of maintaining Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland under the allegedly paternal guidance of the Colonial Office. To the Africans, both alternatives are ' hell,' and their aim is to get out.

African opposition to the Federation has been more than justified by the events that have followed. Nyasaland, in particular, is cited by Federation supporters as a beneficiary from Federation. A few snazzy white buildings may have gone up in Zomba and Blantyre—but for the Africans taxation has increased by 50 per cent, wages are still only 1s. 4d. to 2s. a day, only one child in every 1,000 goes to secondary

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

school, two in every five able-bodied males have to leave the territory to find employment, African trade union and political leaders and hundreds of ordinary people have been arrested, their organisations banned, and many people killed. Such are the benefits Nyasaland has received from Federation.

Africans in Northern Rhodesia have received no better treatment. Their once powerful Mine Workers' union in the Copper Belt has suffered terrible blows, its sixteen leaders permanently exiled from the mining areas and kept under police supervision, thus enabling the employers to enforce a wages standstill for two years. In Southern Rhodesia a new trade union law under the pretence of encouraging 'multi-racial unions,' denies to Africans the right to form their own unions. If they wish to join a trade union they will have to join the existing European ones which cater for an exclusive white labour aristocracy, and which will undoubtedly draw up their rules in a way which ensures the unions remaining under European control.

Starvation wages, impoverishment of the peasantry, repression against trade unions, the banning of political parties—these are the realities of the 'partnership' policy of the Federal Government. Paltry manoeuvres, like the abolition of separate counters at post-offices, will fool no one, especially in view of Welensky's open and cynical declaration:

> I am satisfied that if all discriminations were removed the Africans to a very large extent would be the greatest sufferers.
> (*Rhodesia Herald*, March 17, 1959)

In both Rhodesia and in Nyasaland, the leaders of the African organisations have called for secession from the Federation. In anticipation of such demands, the imperialist framers of the Federation Constitution deliberately excluded any mention of secession from the Constitution. Thus, if the African people are not to be driven into attempting to take their secession by force, there is only one thing left to do—repeal the Federation Act itself.

It is important that the campaign for this be mounted now, both because of the talks the Tory leaders are conducting with the Labour leaders to reach an agreed policy on Central Africa (and whatever one's views may be of Mr. Gaitskell, one can be sure that any policy which has the agreement of the Tories will be one which maintains the realities of imperial power in Central Africa, even if certain surface features are cleaned up), and because of the pressure coming from reactionary circles in Britain and in the Federation to block permanently any African escape from the Federation hell.

> We are here to stay (Sir Roy Welensky, in a speech reported in *East Africa and Rhodesia*, February 5, 1959)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Any idea of hoping to solve the problem through the 1960 Conference to review the Federal Constitution, on the basis of representation from the five governments—Britain, the Federation, Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia and Nyasaland—can only lead to the surrender of the real interests of the African people, who will have no representation at such a conference. The Federation Act should be repealed, universal adult suffrage introduced in all three territories, and the African people, as the majority in each case, given the right to form the government of their choice, and to determine their future relations with each other and with other states.

With the shock of the attack on the African people in the Federation, there is a favourable opportunity to develop the campaign in Britain. The courage and dignity of the Africans in the face of sickening brutality and discrimination have not only demonstrated that the imperialist idol has feet of clay, but also touched the heart and conscience of the British people. It was demonstrated in the stand of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (some 1,500 votes to 50 against) in favour of the transfer of effective power to the African community in Nyasaland.

If the British trade union and labour movement speaks out with the same clarity and decisiveness, then any Tory-Labour agreement on Federation can be scotched or its implementation prevented.

Mr. Julian Amery, M.P. Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, has said that 'unless there was mountainous and over-whelming evidence to the contrary, the British Government could not go back on the 1953 decisions that had brought the Federation into being.' (*South Africa*, April 25, 1959). It is up to the British people, and above all the labour movement to see that the 'mountainous and overwhelming evidence' is provided in the form of a mountainous and over-whelming demand that the Federation Act be repealed.

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION RATES

OVERSEAS (post-free) :

Second class mail (unsealed envelope)

Canada and U.S.A.	$3.00
Elsewhere	£1
First class mail (sealed envelope)	
Canada	$3.50
Other Commonwealth countries	£1 4s. 0d.
U.S.A.	$4.50
Other non-Commonwealth countries	£1 12s. 0d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ROAD TO WAPPING STEPS

Councillor Solly Kaye

THE Road to Brighton Pier has similarities with the journey to many a local Town Hall. Indeed the intrigues, the unprincipled manoeuvring, the backstairs agreements, all can be seen at work in the localities if you know where to look, and if you can stand the smell. It is not surprising that when these activities take the place of struggle for principles, the Labour movement ceases to lead campaigns for better conditions, the movement declines and apathy takes the place of eagerness.

This is precisely the situation in many local Labour parties throughout the country. It is certainly the case in East London, where Labour has controlled local councils longer than anywhere else. Here in all too many the old socialist gleam has given way to cynicism when the word 'Socialism' is mentioned; to the coveting of office for the kudos it brings; to the crawling after bourgeois honours and the fear of moving people into action lest it goes further than these 'leaders' can control.

In Stepney this atmosphere has led to a squabble over seats and the decision of fourteen ex-Labour councillors to support a group against the official Labour candidates. Not on issues of policy. Merely because either 'they were left out' or that 'they didn't like the way it was done.' It is this which makes the headlines of the local press. Not the need for housing. Not the crisis over rents. Not the issue of facilities for youth. One worthy Alderman, noted for his anti-Communism (and the irrelevant manner in which he would turn any subject into an attack on the Communists) issued a press statement declaring that he had had all the honours, been Mayor, Alderman, chairman of most committees and he now quits politics! This self-sacrificing campaigner is now a local publican. How much will this kind of thing inspire the young? How much will it rouse the people to clear out the Tories? Yet it is happening in localities throughout the country. As at Brighton Pier, so at Wapping Steps.

Councils today face tremendous difficulties. British imperialism, fighting to maintain itself, does so at the expense of the British and colonial peoples. Social services are now constantly under attack. Housing built by local authorities is the lowest number since 1948. Education is miserably inadequate, with all kinds of makeshift arrangements for the children of the working class. The health service, too, is stinted the money needed for proper development, unable to maintain its services in face of rising costs. The old folk are left to the mercy of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

relatives and Public Assistance. The youth are offered little, either for work or for leisure. All the time the circulars pour into local council offices cutting this standard or that. Only occasionally do the attacks hit the headlines ; the Block Grant ; the Rent Act ; the amendments to the Town and Country Planning Act.

Where does Labour stand on all these things ? Where is the nationwide campaign to build more council homes ? Where is the fight to repeal the Rent Act and expose Macmillan's claim that it is working well ? Where are Labour's demands that will rouse the youth and win them for Socialism ? In hundreds of localities house building has been completely stopped. In hundreds more the burden of high rents is introduced. In Stepney the housing schemes were halted until a campaign led by the Communist councillors forced the Council to start again.

If only Labour would fight on these issues the Tories would be cleared out of Westminster as well as the local Town Halls. But such campaigning is seldom to be seen from Labour parties ; neither from the erstwhile Keep-Lefts, nor from the always Stay-Rights.

Yet many Labour councillors and others would welcome such campaigning. The trade unions and shop stewards' committees could stimulate such efforts if only they ended the deep gulf that undoubtedly exists between themselves and the local authorities. In far too few trade union branches do local councillors give reports on their work and their problems. It was as though the councillors were the fount of all wisdom on local matters. Yet they could do so much more with the closer participation of trade unionists and others in their work. Let me give an example of how Stepney Council throws away opportunities.

The Stepney Labour Council decides to hold a Housing Exhibition. It is planned to take place for three weeks, ending a week before the elections. (A coincidence, perhaps !). The Communist group welcomes the exhibition and asks the Council to ensure that it shows real problems, so that the people of Stepney can help win more homes at lower rents. What result ? A technically well produced exhibition, greeted by the local and national press as well as by television. Not a word about rents. Not a syllable on the problem created by interest rates. Not a line or a picture dealing with the price of land. Not a dot or comma on the effect of the abolition of subsidies. Not a single suggestion that the Council could do more with more Government help.

A housing exhibition by a Labour Council ! Typical of the way in which most Labour Councils stand up to the Tories. Yet where they try to, as in St. Pancras, they are expelled to Tory applause. And the landlords and money-lenders smirk behind their brandy glasses while their property shares rise.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We Communists stand in Stepney and elsewhere for a policy that would make councils lead the anti-Tory fight throughout the land. We won seats again in Stepney this May because many people had learned through experience that they need Communists to represent them. Indeed, were it not for the effort of non-Party women we should not have been elected. The loss of over 300 seats by Labour in the local elections has a lesson for us all. The lesson shows that we will win nothing if local (and national) politics are a combination of personal squabblings over position and the forgetting or throwing overboard of Socialist aims.

We must end the miserable spectacle that I have seen for years in Stepney, of the Mayor at the end of his year of office reporting that the high point of his Mayoral year was when this or that member of the Royal family visited the Borough. Let such honours be coveted by Tories. Let Labour have confidence in the people and make service to the people their only aim. Let conscious socialist education be part and parcel of all we do. To overcome the losses and prepare for victory at the General Election, Labour must fight, publicly and openly. The doors of the Town Halls must be opened wider so that all can see the problems councils face. Let the people see the enemy they are fighting: the bankers, the landlords, the Tories. This is how, we Communist councillors believe, local authorities can become a tremendous power for social advance and for the establishment of a Socialist Britain.

JUNE FUND TOTAL

£36. 13. 11

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: B. Ainley, 10s.; J. A. Smith, 10s.; H.G.B., 4s.; R. McLeod, 5s.; Anon, 'Whitchurch', 1s.; E.S. (Auckland), 19s. 3d.; S. Mill, £1; Royston Green, 3s. 6d.; O.A.P., 'Notts.', 10s.; C.T.M., 'Mill Hill', 14s. 6d.; W.B.S., 'Ayr', 10s.; M. Philibert, 10s.; J. Tarver, 5s.; R.F.B., £3; M. Illing, 10s.; L. Perkins, 5s.; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 6s.; L'Humanité, 3s.; L. Bates, 3s.; A. T. R. Hooker, £1; 'Oliver Twist' and Friends, 10s.; C. T. Hallinan, £1; E.J.B., 10s.; 'Socialist Sailor', £1; J. A. Purton, 7s. 6d.; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherne, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: A. Idle, 12s.; A. S. Dopson, 2s.; S. W. Ashton, 10s.; F. M. Roy, 2s.; J. McLanachan, £1 2s.; C. M. Truscott, 6s.; D. Mukerji, £1; M. Vanstone, £1 11s.; T. Graham, 12s.; B. H. Steel, 12s.; W. H. Laithwaite, £1; D. R. Morgan, £1; H. F. Westney, £1; M. Strickland, 5s.; L. Ward, 3s.; L. Naftalin, 10s.; A. Winsloe, 5s.; H. G. Coore, 2s.; C. G. R. Smale, 10s. 6d.; P. J. Wallis, 12s.; K. Rintoul, 10s.; A. R. Monkton, 10s.; B. D. Youatt, £1 2s.; J. M. Higginton, £1 2s.; E. M. Berlyn, 6s. 6d.; R. Stubbs, 2s.; E. P. Young, 2s.; D. G. Wallis, £1; W.R.P. (Canada), £2 11s.; P.E.W (Canada), £1; P.N.J. (Australia), £1; A.C.H. (U.S.A.), 14s. 2d.

Our thanks to you all
Co-op. No. L.99482

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A NEW TOWN'S OLD, OLD STORY

Joe Sack

THE right to work is a major economic issue in Crawley New Town, even though the unemployed percentage is, and always has been, much below the national average. There have been more industrial disputes on this issue than any other, not just in the past twelve months but almost from the beginning of the new town. All firms in Crawley were located in London and houses are available to all who worked at these firms at the time of moving. Houses are not 'tied' and having once moved to the new town the tenancy conditions that apply are similar to those of most local authorities.

The Development Corporation, set up by the Government to build it, put forward the conception of the new town as a place where employment would be within walking or cycling distance from home. Indeed, they made this one of their selling points. They also claimed that by careful selection of applicants for factories, they were ensuring continuous employment for the workers. But even in the palmy days of 1952, the Shop Stewards Committee of the engineering firm I work for, with the Crawley move in mind, were trying to extract from the management a guarantee of full employment.

Fortunately, among the first to move to Crawley were two well-organised trade union shops, where militant workers were constantly discussing the many problems of life in the new town. The trade union movement rapidly grew conscious of the need to make its voice heard on all issues—political and economic—facing the town.

Over three years ago, the town's largest works laid off two machine shop employees. The workers' reply was immediate. The machine shop walked out, and soon other sections—embracing several unions—joined them. A four weeks' struggle followed, and resulted in the two men being offered back their jobs and an agreement with the stewards which to this day remains one of the best achieved anywhere in the country. Incidentally, during this strike we had an innovation—meetings called especially for strikers' wives. The agreement won stipulates that no worker would leave the factory until he had found suitable alternative employment. The stewards have also battled to make their management go all out for East-West trade, and have themselves visited the Soviet and Chinese trade missions. Today that factory is working on a Soviet contract and is now taking on labour.

Struggles in other factories have taken place ; the most recent example was just after Christmas. A small engineering firm declared twelve

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The DOCK LABOURERS' STRIKE

(The following song is being sung in the East End to the tune of 'God Save Ireland.' Its lack of literary finish may be easily pardoned in a spontaneous popular effusion of the kind.

From Commonweal, September, 1889)

At the Docks there is a strike the Companies don't like,
A tanner an hour a working man to pay;
Like slaves they'd have them work far worse than any Turk
And make them sweat their lives out every day.

(Refrain)
Strike, boys, for better wages,
Stand out until they give you better pay;
You work hard at the docks, stick out like fighting cocks,
Then the masters all to you they must give way.

Every morning there flocks for employment at the docks
Hard working men who scarce can get a meal,
With wives and children dear 'twill make you shed a tear,
If you only know the hardships that they feel.

(Refrain) Strike, boys, etc.

If you stick up for your rights you'll put the Companies in a plight
For meetings and processions there has been,
Speeches in galore and the jolly stevedores
The Seamen and the Firemen, too, were seen.

(Refrain) Strike, boys, etc.

There's a lot of men they seek for about a pound a week,
They'll take on any duffer that comes near,
It is sweating with a will, they try your place to fill,
But that won't wash with working men, that's clear.

(Refrain) Strike, boys, etc.

Starvation 'tis they bids to a man with seven kids,
When he brings home only fifteen pence a day,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dockers demonstrating in London's East End. 'Father Neptune' in the procession in which the rank-and-file raised funds and aroused support in a way characteristic of the 'New Unionism'.

What can they get to eat? a bloater's quite a treat
It often takes him all his rent to pay.

(Refrain) Strike, boys, etc.

Here's a health to Mr. Burns, he's done us all a turn,
Mr. Tillett, Mr. Mann and Mr. Toomey too,
Don't give in for a bit, for you've got them in a fit,
You've put the Dock Companies in a stew.

(Refrain) Strike, boys, etc.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers redundant and refused any discussion with the stewards. The entire engineering section (the firm is in two parts) struck. The firm replied by serving writs on two stewards and sending dismissal notices to all, saying they were winding up their engineering division. The lads refused to accept this treatment, continuing to picket the firm, not signing on at the Labour Exchange ; and declaring themselves on strike, called for official union recognition.

After a month of struggle they remained as solid as a rock. A delegation from the Amalgamated Engineering Union executive committee, led by the President, visited the firm ; and the lads on strike found themselves being told by the A.E.U. executive committee : ' Pack it up. Seek other work.' Unfortunately the fight had been weakened because workers in the other sections remained at work. But it was not over as far as the unemployed were concerned. They now signed on at the Labour Exchange, but also met every day in the local meeting hut. They continued to send out teams of speakers to London trade union branches and regularly covered the Crawley industrial area with leaflets, thanking all for their continuing financial support, and putting the case for the right to work. A coachful joined the Scottish miners in their march and lobby of Parliament. Those who found employment met with those still unemployed on Friday nights to discuss the position. The convenor of this firm had been blacklisted. Even the personal pleading of the Labour Exchange manager failed to secure this highly-skilled engineer a job after five months' unemployment. But in the sixth month, after he had been told once again : ' Not suitable,' a threatened stoppage inside made one of the blacklisters change his mind.

The local A.E.U. organising committee has played a big part in mobilising assistance to workers in struggle. The A.E.U. national committee resolutions rejecting compensation and calling for struggle for the right to work were made fully known, popularised and helped to expose the inactivity of the right-wing majority on the executive council. A.E.U. stewards are quickly called together to discuss ways of assisting fellow workers in dispute, and thousands of pounds have been collected, very often by a levy of one hour's pay, or more, per week. During the last dispute, the committee organised a march and meeting in the town's crowded shopping centre on a Saturday afternoon. The majority of the marchers were workers in employment.

How much more successful the struggles would have been if the union executives were conducting a united fight against sackings, instead of arguing whether one or two weeks' pay is sufficient compensation for a worker put on the stones ! A few weeks ago, the trades council, the A.E.U. local organising committee and the National Federation of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Building Trade Operatives called a very successful conference on unemployment. In spite of the comparatively low unemployed percentage, a great deal of concern is felt by workers and the public at large.

As for the future, the staggering problems that arise under capitalism are clear. The new towns have been built without any thought of tomorrow. All new towns have very large numbers of married people with growing families. In the main, old folk and single people did not move from London ; so although at present the number of school-leavers is below the national average, rising in a couple of years to the national average, it then climbs rapidly to more than twice the national average by the late sixties. Placing school-leavers is a problem now because the age composition of the town means few workers retiring through old age and sickness. It is not far-fetched to say that if the present set-up remains, many of today's youngsters will be forty before having a chance of a local job.

It is not surprising that the whole need for economic planning is becoming clearer. Demands for the right to work need to be joined with the demand for future work for the thousands of children. Neither Tory take-over bidders nor Labour state-share buyers can possibly solve this new town problem. Only a socialist solution is practical.

A vast building programme for all the new towns is needed now to provide the normal social amenities. There is still no sign in Crawley of the swimming pool, hospital, library or town hall, without mentioning community centres, nurseries, etc.—all shown on the original plans. Plans should be made now for the coming thousands of 'teenagers who will also be requiring housing not so many years ahead. The government must be made responsible for promoting new industries and offices, bearing in mind the future need for jobs. A much stronger fight for higher wages and the 40-hour week is an urgent necessity and is beginning to be seen as corresponding to present and future needs.

The financial structure of the new towns faces the Urban District Councils with problems that cannot be solved within the present ' constitutional ' framework. New town councils could mobilise the people for active struggle against the Tory economic policies. The five hundred thousand new towners could be a powerful force if they acted together.

RESTRAINT ROUND THE TABLE

It is not enough just to appeal to the unions. You have to get round the table with them and say : ' In what circumstances do you think it would be possible to have some measure of restraint ? '

Mr. HUGH GAITSKELL, M.P., January 23, 1958.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SHOP STEWARD'S JOB

J. W. Tocher*

IT is true to say, even today, that it is a most difficult thing for an individual worker to conduct him or herself with pride and dignity on the factory premises, without fear of repercussion from the management or their representatives on the factory floor.

This is no accident, or some form of misunderstanding. To a large degree it has been done purposely to maintain discipline and, above all, to keep the industrial worker in his or her place and station in life. Here, on the factory floor, we find the class struggle in its most ruthless form, with the shop steward, consciously or not, playing a prominent part. Every strike, every ban on overtime, every declaration of work to rule, is part and parcel of the class struggle. The shop steward therefore is a very important individual indeed. This fact the Tory government and the employers have quickly grasped. Hence their efforts to weaken shop stewards' organisation and its influence in every conceivable way.

To understand the present position of the organised factory worker and his direct representative in the factory, the shop steward, we must briefly examine the development of workshop organisation between the wars.

The road has been anything but smooth. Formidable opponents like the employers' organisations linked with successive hostile governments and, not least, the national press, with its continual and deliberate lies and misrepresentations. Pioneers of the shop stewards suffered constant victimisation and persecution which followed them from factory to factory. The present day working class owe much to these stalwarts, for they laid the foundations under very difficult conditions and were more often than not on the defensive. During this period the employers had the economic tide in their favour, with shortage of work and abundance of labour. In consequence, some of the worst conditions and agreements were imposed. For be it noted, when the employers' bargaining power is at its strongest there is no dubiety about their attitude, a lesson the trade union leadership could well learn. Many of these agreements operate today. In the engineering industry we are still working under the ones established in 1918 and 1922; and it must be born in mind that those imposed in the 'twenties were generally worse than the previous ones.

---

*Mr. J. W. Tocher, as many of our readers will know, is the Secretary-Convenor of the Shop Stewards' Committee of one of the biggest aircraft engineering firms in North-West England.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This aspect of pre-war conditions has quite a bearing on present day circumstances. Today engineering employers refuse to amend or modify them and we have seen how they have been re-affirmed at the insistence of right wing leadership, as part of the strings accepted with the 1957 wage agreement affecting almost 3,000,000 engineering workers. This was after the national wage strike had been ended, when at its height, by the casting vote of the president at the Amalgamated Engineering Union Executive Council. Yet the magnificent solidarity displayed by the engineering workers showed the way forward, not only for the wage increase but also to make the 40 hour week a fact and not just an aspiration as it is at present. Be in no doubt that the conclusion of that strike has yet to be fought ; and victory must include a complete review of these antiquated agreements.

This is, very briefly, one important aspect of the general background with which most factory organisations have been faced since the end of the war. However these questions have been approached from the top, the shop stewards' movement has done a first class job. They have not been slow to take note of the economic fact of full employment, which must never be under-estimated. In some areas we have even witnessed competition by employers for labour. This has been conducive to many improvements.

In today's conditions, in most factories, the national agreements are looked upon as unacceptable or as the absolute minimum, especially in the case of wages. There has emerged the strongest and most effective shop stewards' movement this country has ever seen ; so much so that although employers may have been able to establish certain principles nationally, locally at factory level they have been unable to implement them. Where an employer has tried, he has found on many occasions that the shop organisation is far too strong for him, especially where a militant rank and file membership is led by a progressive body of shop stewards. This has alarmed government and employers ; and the stage is now being set to ' put matters right.' They quite rightly see the shop stewards' movement as the body that stands between them and a cheap labour force, with all the pre-war conditions of employment. They also see a threat to their very existence should it develop further.

Hence we see every aid of the state used with the utmost co-operation from the national press. Hence the so-called impartial ' Courts of Enquiry ' and the constant suggestions that shop stewards are ' irresponsible.' Hence the cry for legislation to control and curb shop stewards, the government policy of creating a pool of unemployment, not only to make the economy work—as they put it—but to use the unemployed as the tool to introduce the first direct attacks on the organised

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

workers. The most revolting aspect of this is the dirty role that some right wing trade union leaders are playing, by attacking their progressive colleagues. People in leading positions act against the progressive leaders of the Electrical Trades Union, like Frank Foulkes and Frank Haxell, and are not fit to lick their shoes.

The growing practice of press interference in trade union elections has not come about by accident. When the *Daily Mail* could declare the result of an election for the national president of an important union a fortnight before it was officially declared to the membership, we have travelled far indeed. In some big industrial areas the press is better informed of the union's local affairs than the membership. It is constantly making personal attacks on the best types of shop stewards the movement has. What some of these right wingers who collaborate with the press fail to realise is that, if the militants and progressives are 'successfully' discredited and removed from office, it is only a matter of time before the press and those sinister forces behind them will set about the right wingers. They would find themselves the victims of their own plots. The story of the London B.O.A.C. strike and what happened at the abortive 'Court of Enquiry' shows how far attacks on the shop stewards can go.

Employers become more confident in their attacks on shop stewards. Where workers take strike action to protect their shop stewards from victimisation, the employer often feels assured of the support of the right wing leadership to get the workers back to work. There have even been cases of ordering union members back to work under the threat of losing their entitlement to dispute benefit from the union. This happened recently where a convenor had been sacked. Once the workers were forced to resume work without him, there was very little prospect of him being re-employed.

Many cases happen when you have to ask yourself: whose interests do some of these right wingers represent? These are problems the rank and file membership must be made fully aware of. Every effort must be made to give them the facts, and to combat the half truths and distortions presented by the national press.

The shop steward is a worker elected by the workers from the bench or factory floor who endeavours to do his best, in many cases under very difficult conditions. He usually loses financially by accepting the position of shop steward. He is attacked in all quarters; he is intimidated; he gives up a lot of spare time in pursuit of his activities; his wife and family are very often called upon to make sacrifices owing to his position; and, above all, he or she is carrying the responsibility in the main of improving the lot of the working class, at their place of work today. They deserve to be defended with all the strength at our disposal.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARAB WORLD AND US

N. S. Khrushchov

Mr. N. S. Khrushchov recently gave an important interview to Mr. R. K. Karanjia, Editor of the Indian newspaper BLITZ. A large section dealt with the Arab world and its problems. It is here printed in part for the benefit of our readers whom the capitalist press has denied the opportunity of reading.—Ed., L.M.

R. K. KARANJIA : A crisis is apparent in the relations between two Arab states, the United Arab Republic and Iraq, as a result of the recent developments in the Middle East. In this connection, the opinion is expressed that the Soviet Union has, so it is alleged, changed its attitude to " Arab nationalism." Moreover, the Soviet Union is accused of intending to " entrench itself in the Middle East with the help of Arab communists," to seize Iraq, to set up a red " Fertile Crescent," which would give the Soviet Union " access to the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean."

What can you say about these allegations ?

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV : All this is imputed to the Soviet Union by our opponents. These are all vicious fabrications. Why should we seek access to the Persian Gulf or the Indian Ocean ? Expansionist tendencies are alien to our system, to a socialist state. Our people are well settled on our own land ; they are satisfied with their status and derive great benefits from their work on their land. They are developing and utilising its natural wealth to an increasing extent. We have everything we need : territory, vast natural resources, access to seas and oceans. Those who accuse the Soviet people of seeking to seize foreign lands would, so to speak, do better to look at their own shady record. This slander against the Soviet state can only be spread by people who themselves aspire to conquests, who aspire to foment enmity between peoples.

The Soviet Union has always stood for the recognition of the following principle : every nation, wherever it may live, lives on its own land and should itself enjoy all the benefits of its labour. Every nation determines for itself the way of life it considers it best to have. The interests, the way of life and the culture of every nation should be strictly respected. The Soviet Union is really and truly devoted to these principles. Anyone who tries to ascribe to us any schemes of predatory conquest, is either counting on mentally retarded people or is measuring us by his own yardstick.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

KARANJIA : Two questions arise in this connection. Firstly, concerning relations between Iraq and the United Arab Republic. Taking into account the great influence that the Soviet Union has in the Arab world, is there any chance of the Soviet Union using that influence to help to overcome the quarrel between Iraq and the United Arab Republic and to bring Kassem and Nasser closer together? And the second question : what are the prospects, in this connection, for future relations between the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic?

KHRUSHCHOV : The reasons for the present conflict between the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic are well known. When Gamal Abdel Nasser was here in the Soviet Union last year we rejoiced together at the successful revolution in Iraq. But later on he apparently changed his mind and the relations between the two Arab Republics also changed. What was the reason for that? Frankly speaking, the reason was that some people in the United Arab Republic apparently wanted Iraq to merge with it. But the people of the Republic of Iraq did not want that. Consequently there were all manner of intrigues and even plots. That is always the case when one state starts interfering in the domestic affairs of others. Any state begins to resist when attempts are made to play the master over it. An example of that is also given by the relations between the United Arab Republic and Iraq.

We are sorry that matters have taken that turn, because we ardently sympathise with the national liberation movement of the peoples of the Arab countries who are fighting for their national independence. We have never changed our attitude towards the national liberation movement of the Arab peoples, and we never shall. It stems from the Leninist principles of friendship between peoples. We have sympathised with, and assisted, the success of the liberation struggle of the peoples and we shall continue to further it. Imperialism, colonialism, is the main enemy of the Arabs. And all those who, in these circumstances, weaken the solidarity of the Arab peoples are making a grave mistake. One cannot but notice that, owing to such actions, two Arab peoples are expending their energies on a struggle between one Arab state and another and not on joint action against their real enemies. Only the imperialist states, the colonialists, stand to gain by that. This enables them to continue with their policy of " divide and rule."

It is to be hoped that the leaders of the Arab countries will realise the need for approaching the existing situation sensibly so as to settle the conflict and not let the enemies of the Arabs exploit this conflict for their own selfish interests.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

We would be only too happy to see the Arab states live in peace and friendship and pool their efforts in order to struggle against the colonialists. That would be best. But that can be achieved only if a strict policy of non-interference by one set of states in the affairs of others is abided by. This means that no one should seek to subjugate any other state or states, either administratively or even morally, because the states which have thrown off colonial dependence will not want to find themselves dependent even on their own brothers from another state. An awareness of that fact would help to make the situation normal and create good relations between the Arab countries. The national liberation movement in the Arab countries would gain by that and so, too, would the economic and cultural advancement of those countries and the cause of peace in the Middle East.

KARANJIA : What are the prospects in the relations between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, taking into consideration the present state of those relations? You have, I believe, exchanged messages with President Nasser ?

KHRUSHCHOV : Yes, I did send a message to President Nasser, but I have not yet received a reply. Properly speaking, we have no conflict at all with the United Arab Republic. We are not demanding anything of the Arab republics, or for that matter of any other states. We intend to go on basing our relations with the United Arab Republic on equality, respect for sovereignty, and mutual benefit. The Soviet Union has never interfered in the internal affairs of other states and never intends to do so. The peoples of the United Arab Republic have no more sincere and true friend than the Soviet Union. What do we need from the Arabs? Nothing at all. We have everything the Arabs have except, perhaps, mangoes. But I think we shall be able to get along somehow even without mangoes.

KARANJIA : We can give you better mangoes.

KHRUSHCHOV : That's right, the Indians have good mangoes.

We have done much to help Egypt. But now, for some reason, President Nasser has forgotten about that and says that during the Suez conflict he relied only on himself and on Allah. He has forgotten what the Soviet Union and the other peaceloving states did for his country when it was beset with difficulties. Everyone knows what part the Soviet Union played in curbing the aggression against Egypt and in removing the threat of an attack on Syria.

President Nasser may find himself under the United States saddle. Then he will get to know from practical experience what the Soviet

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

socialist policy is like and what the United States policy is like. So far this is being concealed from people, but we, at any rate, know how the United States wants to saddle the United Arab Republic.

Friendship is a reciprocal thing. And if the leaders of the United Arab Republic do not now want to have friendly relations with the Soviet Union, that is their own affair. We shall live through it somehow, and if anyone is the loser by it, it won't be the Soviet Union, in any case. However, we would like to preserve friendly relations. because this would be of benefit to both our countries and especially to the Arab peoples, to all the peoples who are waging a struggle against the colonialists. It would be of benefit to peace.

KARANJIA : I have formed the opinion that the relations between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, or the relations between Delhi and Peking, are providing some people in the West with material for creating the impression that the Soviet Union, and China as well, have begun to pursue power politics in some parts of the world. Some people in the West even allege that there was a shift in Soviet policy between the 20th and 21st Congresses of the C.P.S.U. They say that whereas previously the Soviet Union supported bourgeois national governments even when there was friction between these governments and the local Communist Parties, now, on the contrary, the Soviet Union is supporting the local Communist Parties, even when they are in conflict with local national bourgeois governments.

I believe this is a slander. But as a friend of progress I would like to ask you to explain whether there have really been any changes in Soviet policy in this connection ?

KHRUSHCHOV : You correctly understand the real state of affairs when you say that you disbelieve that slander.

We are continuing firmly to abide by the decisions of the 20th Congress in the same way as we are carrying out the decisions of the 21st Congress. There are no contradictions at all between them. The decisions of the 21st Congress are a continuation and development of the decisions of the 20th Congress. And if the 21st Congress did not repeat the decisions of the previous congress, it was because it was not a regular congress, that is to say, a congress to hear a report of the central committee of the C.P.S.U. and pass the appropriate resolutions characterising the path covered and charting further prospects. Being an extraordinary congress, the 21st Congress assembled for a special purpose. It discussed the Seven-Year Plan. The decisions which it took were in keeping with the aims that were set when it was called.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our government has not changed anything in its foreign policy recently. We have stood and continue to stand for good, normal relations with all countries, irrespective of their state and social systems. We have maintained and are continuing to maintain good relations with bourgeois governments and with monarchist governments if they also strive to maintain relations of that kind with our country. Our relations with Afghanistan are a case in point. Afghanistan is a kingdom, but we maintain the best of relations with this kingdom ; we are supporting and even rendering assistance to this kingdom. We have good relations with the King and we were pleased when he visited our country as our guest. We shall be glad to meet him when he again has the opportunity to come to our country. We are neighbours of Afghanistan, but Afghanistan has never presented any claims to us ; we are not encroaching on her rights and are not interfering in her domestic affairs ; we have a tranquil frontier with Afghanistan.

Or take another example—Great Britain, too, is a kingdom, but we want to improve our relations with Great Britain as well. The system that exists in Great Britain is a matter for the British people. In relations with other countries we are also strictly guided by the principle of non-interference in domestic affairs.

Why, then, have we made some critical remarks with regard to President Nasser ? Was that a breach of our policy of non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries ? No, it was not a repudiation of our principles. The point is that President Nasser undertook to pass judgment on communism as a world movement and a teaching but, unfortunately, he apparently has a poor knowledge of this teaching and therefore fell into a number of distortions. We naturally came out in defence of this teaching. Didn't we have the right to come out in defence of the teaching to which we adhere, which we apply and which has yielded great, beneficial results for the peoples, for the world ? Don't we have the right to defend our world outlook ? It is not our aim to have the United Arab Republic follow this teaching. What views to hold and what policy to pursue in the United Arab Republic—that is the internal, sovereign right of its government and people. But if communism as a teaching is criticised and distorted, we Communists must defend it. We have done so and shall always do so with the utmost determination.

The communist teaching is a great teaching. It has demonstrated to the world its advantages as compared with all the other existing teachings and world outlooks. Attacks on communism have so far brought no laurels to anyone, although people have now been making them for over 100 years. Fascist Germany was stronger than Egypt when Hitler raised the banner of anti-communism and launched a struggle against com-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

munism from the standpoint of bellicose and chauvinist nationalism. And Mussolini had engaged in that struggle even earlier. What has happened to them ? They are long since gone, while communist ideas have become the banner, the dominant ideology of many countries in Europe and Asia with a population of about 1,000 million people.

We are firmly convinced that no matter who tackles such an ungrateful task as the struggle against communism, he will meet with no success. All such people can be told outright : You're trying to bite off more than you can chew ; nothing will come of it ! Yet in doing this a definite line must be drawn : the communist teaching is one thing and the internal system of a state is another thing. We have recognised, and we recognise now, the right of a people to choose for themselves the system that suits them in a particular period. Let the people in the United Arab Republic live in the way they want and let them have there the system that suits them. That is their own domestic affair.

You might ask : doesn't this run counter to the statements I have already made on this question ? After all, I have said that the development of human society is leading to the victory of communism throughout the world. That is correct—communism will be victorious throughout the world. But how will it win ? It will win, not by force of arms on the part of states which adhere to communist positions, but because the peoples of all countries will become convinced that only communist society meets the aspirations of the nations, ensures the really complete material and spiritual emancipation of man and provides greater material and spiritual benefits. People will realise this and they will organise their society along communist lines without outside interference. Naturally, in order to go over to communist construction it is necessary to prepare very well, to prepare the state, to prepare the economy, to prepare the minds of the people. Only now are we able to go over to the comprehensive building of communism, but the other countries still have to create these conditions. The Arabs, too, will come to this, but will come in due time. No one can keep peoples from it. People cannot be kept away from a better life ; they will surmount every obstacle and achieve that life. And a better life worthy of man can be brought to all people only by the communist system.

We have never called on the Arab peoples or other peoples to embark on the building of communism. That would be sheer folly. We have openly told the peoples of Asia and Africa, and we continue to tell them, that we sympathise with their struggle for independence, for liberation from the colonial yoke. We wish them success in the struggle for the advance of their economy, culture and welfare.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE MORNING AFTER THE 'TONIGHT' BEFORE

D. H. Calcutt

I LISTENED to a gabbled denunciation of Mr. Khrushchov on the B.B.C. *Tonight* programme. It was hurried over. They could not get it all in. They had such piles of stored up material and, as Mr. Dimbleby says, 'Time presses.' It would be a pity to have to leave out that particular piece of venom ; we must get in that bit of ridicule. Stoke up the fires of hate. The B.B.C. is the cold war. I do not know whether those who present the programme are sincere. I would like to think that they were sincere. But then, it was not exactly spontaneous, was it ? They had worked on it a long time in preparation for the event and the day. They had got it all ready and prepared and selected the bits of film and decided on the appropriate extracts. Then, as the announcer was gabbling away, I remembered back to the reverential treatment of Adenauer the day or so previously.

'Foxy' Adenauer we called him when we were in Cologne in 1918. (The young man who read the script would not know of course, he was not yet in his pram. But the fellows that prepared the script should know). He was Mayor of Cologne at the time, and we were disarming 'the horrid Hun.' And the B.B.C. pet, Dr. Adenauer, was taking his instructions from the President of the new German set-up in Berlin as to how to diddle the thick stupid British. As the *Daily Mail* used to have it on its headlines where it has 'For Queen and Country' now : 'They will cheat you yet, those Junkers.'

We, the survivors of years of horror, had just struggled out of the trenches—'Alive, by God'! And we determined not to forget. We put 'Lest We Forget' on our memorials. We remember our pals. Not all the Unknown Soldiers are dead. H. G. Wells' Mr. Lewisham was not with me in Cologne. He was killed. He never lived to hug his Ethel in his eager arms. No, his pink and white youth, his soft flesh aglow, with a letter from Ethel in his pocket, came to a sudden finish. Nothing glorious. Just a stray splinter of shrapnel from a not very strategic shell, and with an oath on his lips, with a 'just my bloody luck, Duggie old boy,' poor Lewisham died in my arms.

We know where Mr. Khrushchov was in those days. They had got fed up with the whole bloody business earlier. They chucked their hand in and resolved 'never again.'

Soon after the diplomats had blown the whistle for the slaughter of the innocents to cease in 1918, I was lying in a pig sty with a pig grunting away on the other side of a worm-eaten elm board, recovering as best I

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

might from the prevailing influenza epidemic that was playing havoc, especially amongst those who had got safely through behind the lines. A letter arrived from my brother in the artillery in the rear, telling me that my elder brother (tents for Mesopotamia) had just been presented by his wife with a son. The Adenauers were at the time happily murdering Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg with the full approval of their enemies. I replied that from what I could see from my pig sty of what was going on, the boy would be just in time to be called up for the war of revenge of 1940. (He was duly called up in 1940 and was sent to Burma).

I find it difficult to believe that these B.B.C. fellows think Dr. Adenauer, old Leather Look, with a face like the back end of an elephant, is a fine character to die for. If we were to bring back Mr. Lewisham and the Unknown Warrior, would they consider their Ethels well lost for the latest collection of initial letters my son is expected to be ready to die for ?

Colonel T. E. Lawrence, of Arabia, was writing of me and Mr. Lewisham, killed before he got his Ethel :

> We were fond together. The morning freshness of the world-to-be intoxicated us. We were wrought up with ideas inexpressible and vaporous, but to be fought for. We lived many lives in those whirling campaigns, never sparing ourselves yet, when we achieved, and the new world dawned, the old men came out again and took our victory to re-make in the likeness of the former world they knew. Youth could win, but had not learned to keep, and was pitiably weak against age. We stammered that we had worked for a new heaven and a new earth, and they thanked us kindly and made their peace.

Besides, we have not the time nor the money. We have a living to earn. I bash this out hurriedly in the bedroom before getting on with the day's chores, but the B.B.C. boys have got all day to do their masters' work.

The Adenauers and the Dulles were writing their diaries in 1919. As Siegfried Sassoon wrote (when slogging up to Arras with rifle and pack, side by side with the Unknown Warrior, who was not a hack journalist, so far as we know) :

> *So that's your Diary—that's your private mind*
> *Translated into shirt-sleeved history. That*
> *Is what diplomacy has left behind*
> *For after-ages to peruse, and find*
> *What passed beneath your elegant silk-hat.*

Or, if you prefer Lawrence, back from his Arabian 'dupes, wholeheartedly fighting the enemy.'

> There seemed no straight walking for us leaders in this crooked lane of conduct, ring within ring of unknown, shamefaced motives cancelling or double-charging their precedents.

Shades of poor deluded Rupert Brooke thanking God who 'had matched

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

him with that hour,' and ' caught his youth ' to ' turn glad from a world grown old and cold and weary.'

Let us get ourselves all blown up for old Adenauer, and the B.B.C. boys will run and throw their little tomatoes at Khrushchov along with the rest.

And where is the British public in all this ? Why, he of course must be a character like Bernard Bresslaw portrays. You stick the microphone in front of his tie, and he burbles just enough to show he is inarticulate and off you go, and on with the cold war. But a warning for cold war warriors. Bernard Bresslaw's ' chump ' will be found poor material on which to found a strategy based on the horrors of nuclear war. Your masters will discover when they pull the lever in the upholstered and plate glass sanctum where they hatch their plots, that there is nothing on the end, and that we are not prepared to be tamely roasted alive for the head noises of a journalist.

Listen to Churchill :

> I must make one admission and my admission is a formidable one. The deterrent does not cover the case of lunatics. That is a blank.

Shades not of Rupert Brooke this time but of William Forrestal throwing himself out of the window.

If all this makes the B.B.C. *Tonight* fellows a little uncomfortable, it is the best I can hope to do ; not in the cause of enmity and spite, but just a little reminder from G. K. Chesterton's *Secret People*.

Smile at us, pay us, pass us, but do not quite forget
For we are the people of England, that never have spoken yet.
You laugh at us and love us, both mugs and eyes are wet,
Only you do not know us. For we have not spoken yet.

FREEDOM FROM THE PRESS

Keep clear of the poison of the press,
Let your grand old misleaders alone,
It will pay for all your pains to educate your brains
And do a little thinking of your own;
When leisure and pleasure shall be free,
And hardship and hunger shall go,
When the worker has his place at the top of the tree,
And the loafer is somewhere down below, below, below,
And the loafer is somewhere down below.

C. W. Beckett, published in **Commonweal,**
March 17, 1888

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HANDEL AT HALLE

Alan Bush

APRIL 14 of this year was the bi-centenary of the death of George Frideric Handel, to use the spelling which the composer himself adopted during the latter part of his 47 years spent in England. He was born in Halle on the River Saale in 1685, where he went to school and studied law for one year in the University, the first in Germany to give instruction in German language, and a centre of humanist thought. Halle is situated in the German Democratic Republic and since 1952 annual festivals of his works have been held there, organised by the Handel Committee of the German Democratic Republic with the support of its Ministry of Culture.

The eighth festival in this present centenary year was international in scope as far as both performers and audience were concerned. Choirs, conductors and soloists from Czechoslovakia, England and the U.S.S.R., and solo performers in addition from France and Italy supplemented the forces from the German Democratic Republic itself, while among the audience were visitors from seventeen countries, including China, the U.S.A. and Western Germany.

Handel was represented in the programme by four operas, five oratorios and shorter vocal and instrumental works. There were also performances of 15th and 16th century English music, Purcell, Scarlatti, early French and Italian music, and works by living composers, including Shostakovich, Poulenc, Benjamin Britten and myself. The festival closed with the 'Mansfeld Oratorio' by Ernst Hermann Meyer, author of *The Golden Age of English Music* (published by Lawrence and Wishart) and president for this year of the Halle Handel Committee.

The mornings were occupied by a musicological congress, at which more than thirty papers were read. It is worth comparing the subjects treated there with those of the five lectures which are being given during our Purcell-Handel Festival. In Halle the lectures fell under four main headings :

Handel's Life, personality and surroundings
Handel's transference from opera to oratorio
Structural principles in Handel's music
Questions of the realistic performance of Handel's works.

among the titles were the following :

Handel's attitude to the social problems of his day in England
The intellectual world of the young Handel
Handel's use of language
The question of the biblical cloak of Handel's oratorios

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The problem of the interpretation of Handel's oratorios
The watermarks in Handel's manuscripts and early editions with reference to their date
The problems of tempo in Handel performances
Symphonic development in Handel
The world of Handel's Italian Cantatas
The essence of bel canto
The structure of recitative in Handel's works
The dramaturgical conception behind the Handel opera productions in Halle.

In England two of the five lectures deal in general with the oratorios and instrumental works respectively, one is entitled ' The Humour of Handel ', and of the remaining two, one is an elaborated version of the significant lecture on the problems of tempo in Handel performances by the same lecturer, Professor Larsen, the other deals with ' Handel and his Italian Background ', a different treatment of the above-mentioned Halle lecture. The scope, apart from the numbers of the Halle lectures is both wider and the subjects treated more precise and significant.

The Handel performances in Halle covered an astonishing range. The five oratorios and four operas included both the known and the almost unknown, the ' Messiah ' and ' The Triumph of Time and Truth,' ' Julius Caesar ' and ' Ariodante.' To most foreign visitors the greatest attractions were the brilliant opera productions with their vivid acting. But all present were carried away by the oratorio 'Belshazzar,' as sung by the Berlin Radio chorus and orchestra with excellent soloists, conducted by Helmuth Koch.

It is not only, or even primarily, the size and broadness of the Halle festivals which constitute their importance. But the scientific sociological and historical approach to the composer which informs them and the consequent realisation of his true intentions to a depth never achieved before. This comprehension of his art and its realisation in performance are the result of long and detailed study by a group of Marxist musicologists of the German Democratic Republic, of whom Professor Ernst Hermann Meyer, Johanna Rudolph, Konrad Sasse and Professor Walter Siegmund-Schultze are the outstanding figures. The position of Handel in the history of music is summarised as follows :

> Handel is unquestionably the composer of the first half of the 18th century who, through the medium of his art, in the most powerful and most concrete manner, incorporated the thought of human progress and of the fight against oppression and superstition, of liberation from these fetters, who sang of the beauty of life, the ideas of love, friendship and peace as did none before him and only Mozart and Beethoven after him. This strength and conscious intention in his creativeness make him one of the greatest representatives of the bourgeois enlightenment.
>
> (Handel Yearbook, 1959)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The object of the Halle festivals is to initiate a movement which will bring Handel in his true greatness to the widest circles of the German Democratic Republic. Their influence is spreading in countries such as Poland and France, where hitherto Handel has been comparatively little known, and may eventually penetrate to Britain, where 150 years' concentration on the 'Messiah' has diverted attention from his social and sometimes even directly political objects.

These efforts of the German Democratic Republic are especially important now that the opposite tendency is being propagated in Western Germany, where a new edition of 'Belshazzar' has just been published, in which the person of Belshazzar, who in the libretto treats the enslaved Jews with the greatest contempt and desecrates their holy vessels by drinking out of them, is put on an exactly equal status with Cyrus, the Persian commander, who in the libretto is characterised as follows :—

> I seek no enemy, except the tyrant ;
> When he is slain, our task is at an end.
> My worthy friends, let us not stain our swords
> With needless slaughter. I begin already
> To count this people mine, myself their shepherd,
> Whose office is to feed and to protect them,
> Not to destroy.

The long and musically developed chorus which ends the second half of the oratorio, rejoices at the destruction of empire, when

> The jar of nations soon would cease.
> Sweet liberty, beatific peace
> Would stretch their wings from shore to shore,
> And war and slavery be no more.

In the new West German edition this chorus is omitted entirely. It is significant that this vile travesty of Handel's most outspoken work proceeds from the country where militarism and imperialism has seized control of all organs of political power.

It has been left to Marxism to fight and win the battle of ideas around the person of George Frideric Handel, and to begin the task of establishing him at last in the eyes of the world in his true stature.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE ARTIST'S WORLD OUTLOOK*

N. A. Dobrolyubov

DIVERSE as the works of a talented artist may be, one can always note something common to them all which characterises each of them and distinguishes them from the works of other writers. In the technical language of art it is customary to call this the artist's world outlook. Vain would be our attempts to reduce this world outlook to definite logical schemes, to express it in abstract formulæ. As a rule these abstractions do not exist in the artist's own mind; not infrequently he even expresses in abstract discussions ideas that are the very opposite of what he expresses in his artistic activity—ideas which he accepts on faith, or which he acquires by means of false, hastily constructed and superficial syllogisms. His actual world outlook, the one that provides the clue to his talent, must be sought in the living images that he creates.

It is here that we find the material difference between the talent of the artist and that of the thinker. In substance, thinking power and creative ability are both characteristic of and equally necessary for the philosopher and the poet. The greatness of a philosophical mind and the greatness of poetic genius equally consist in the ability at a glance to grasp the essential features of an object, distinguish them from the casual ones and organise them properly in one's mind, to master them in such a way as to be able freely to call them forth for every possible combination. But the difference between the thinker and the artist is that the latter's power of perception is much more vivid and powerful than that of the former. Each fashions his world outlook on the basis of the facts that succeeded in reaching his mind. But a man with keener powers of perception, an 'artistic nature,' is powerfully affected by the very first fact of a certain kind that presents itself in surrounding reality. He has not yet worked out any theory that would enable him to explain this fact, but he realises that there is something here that merits special attention, and he examines this fact with keen interest, he assimilates it, nurtures it in his soul, at first as a single image, and then he adds other kindred facts and images to it, and finally creates a type which expresses the essential features of all the particular phenomena of this kind which he has observed before. The thinker, on the other hand, is not affected so quickly and so powerfully. The first fact of a new kind does not produce a vivid impression upon him; in most cases he scarcely notices this fact

*From 'Realm of Darkness' in *Selected Philosophical Essays*, by N. A. Dobrolyubov, pp 235-237. Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow; Collet's, London. 8s. 6d.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and passes it by as if it were a strange accident, without even taking the trouble to assimilate it. (We are not, of course, discussing personal relationships : a philosopher may fall in love, lose his temper and grieve at the first appearance of a fact as quickly as the poet.) Only later, when numerous kindred facts accumulate in his mind, does a man with a low power of perception pay attention to them at last. But here the numerous particular images which he had previously collected and which imperceptibly rest in his mind enable him at once to mould them into a general conception and thus immediately to transfer the new fact from the realm of living reality into the sphere of abstraction. And here a proper place is found for the new idea among a number of other ideas ; its significance is explained, deductions are drawn from it, etc. In the process the thinker —or to put it more simply, the man who reasons—utilises both the real facts and the images which have been reproduced from life by the art of the artist. Sometimes these very images even help the man who reasons to form correct ideas about some of the phenomena of real life. Thus, the importance of artistic activity among other manifestations of social life becomes absolutely clear ; by concentrating the facts of real life, by focussing them as it were, the images created by the artist greatly facilitate the formulation of correct ideas about things and the dissemination of these ideas among men.

Hence it is clear that the principal merit of the author-artist lies in the truth of the images he creates ; if they were not true, false conclusions would be drawn from them and false ideas would result. But what is the truth of artistic images ? Strictly speaking, writers never invent absolute falsehood ; even with respect to the most absurd novels and melodramas it cannot be said that the passions and banalities that are depicted in them are absolutely false, i.e., impossible even as monstrous accidents. But the falsehood of novels and melodramas of this kind lies precisely in that they make the accidental and false features of real life, which do not constitute its substance, its characteristic features. They are false also because, if we formulated theoretical ideas on their basis, we would arrive at absolutely false ideas. For example : there are authors who devote their talent to describing voluptuous scenes and dissolute adventures ; they depict voluptuousness in such a way as to make it appear that it alone constitutes true human happiness. It goes without saying that such a deduction would be absurd, although, of course, there are people who, due to the degree of their development, are incapable of conceiving of any other kind of happiness ... There have been other writers, still more absurd, who have extolled the virtues of the warlike feudal barons who shed rivers of blood, burned down cities and plundered their vassals. There was no downright falsehood in the descriptions

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the facts that were performed by these robbers, but they were presented in such a light, and were so highly praised, that it is clearly evident that the soul of the author who extolled them lacked the sense of human truth. Thus, all one-sidedness and exclusiveness prevents the artist from fully conforming to truth. Consequently, the artist must either keep his simple, childishly direct outlook on the whole world intact, or (since this is absolutely impossible in life) must save himself from one-sidedness by broadening his outlook as much as possible, by assimilating those general ideas that have been worked out by the men who reason. In this way the link between science and art may find expression.

The free transformation of the loftiest speculations into living images, and, at the same time, full understanding of the higher, general meaning of every, even the most particular and accidental, fact of life, is the ideal which represents the complete merging of science and poetry which nobody so far has achieved. But the artist who is guided by correct principles in his general ideas has this advantage over the undeveloped, or falsely developed, writer, that he can freely yield to the suggestions of his artistic nature. His direct feelings will always truly guide him to his object; but when his general ideas are false, a conflict will inevitably arise within him, doubts and irresolution will beset him, and although his works may not be utterly false as a result of this, they will nevertheless turn out to be weak, colourless and inharmonious. On the other hand, when the artist's general ideas are correct and fully harmonise with his nature, this harmony and unity are reflected in his works. Reality is then reflected in his works more brightly and vividly, it can more easily lead the man who reasons to draw correct deductions and, consequently, they will be of more importance in life.

PAST CONTENTS

APRIL: *Communism and the Left* (R.P.D.); *Macmillan's Visit* (Quaestor); *The Tory Offensive* (Frank McKenna, George Alsop); *Nyasaland Massacre* (Hugo Rathbone); *Wood Engraving from Bulgaria* (Vasil Zacharieff; *The Dance of Freedom* ('Kenya Resident'); *Youth in Engineering* (John Foster); *Shorter Hours and the Crisis* (T. F. McWhinnie); *What Soviet People Read* (Judah Waten); BOOK REVIEWS: *The Brave New World* (Helen and Scott Nearing); *Jim Crow Guide to the U.S.A.* (Stetson Kennedy); *Anglo-Soviet Journal* (S.C.R.); *'Blow You Jack, We Were Right'!* (B.O.A.C. Stewards); *History Unearthed* (Sir Leonard Woolley); William Gallacher, J.W., Peter Tempest, Wal Hannington, R. P. Arnot.

MAY: *Honour to Whom Honour* (R.P.D.); *A Significant Congress* (John Gollan); *The Tibetan Serf-Owners' Rebellion* (Alan Winnington); *Lancashire Fights Back* (Harold Dickinson); *Not Recognised* (Ben Wilson); *Is There a Future in Mining?* (Joe Whelan); *Crisis in Transport* (R. H. Smillie); *Trade Unions Under Fire* (O. H. Parsons); *The Artist's One World* (John Berger). BOOK REVIEWS: *People's Capitalism* (J. M. Budish); James Harvey.

JUNE: *Propaganda Fall-Out* (R. Page Arnot); *Geneva and the People* (Nora Jeffery); *Strong Voices for Peace* (Joan Maynard, J.P.); *We Fight Pit Closures* (J. B. Craig); *Drawing: Liverpool Strike 1911*; *The Right to Work Defended* (Edmund Frow); *The Wage Rise That Wasn't* (Dave Bowman); *Fight Back* (Peter Kerrigan); *Tibet and Premier Nehru* (Alan Winnington); *Every Inch a Fighter!*; *'Too Many Young People'*; (Gerry Pocock); *Youth and Skill* ('Tyneside Apprentice'). BOOK REVIEWS: *World Without War* (J. D. Bernal), Dr. E. H. S. Burhop.

JULY: *Labour and the Bomb* (R.P.D.); *Foreign Ministers at Geneva* (Quaestor); *An Inside Story* (D. N. Pritt, Q.C.); *Drawing: Bloody Sunday, 1887*; *Nato with Dungarees On* (J. Jarvie); *What the Shareholders Cost Us* (N. Temple); *Unity on the Rails* (J. Oldbury); *The Kirk in Scotland and Nyasaland* (William Gallacher). BOOK REVIEWS: *Ballet School of the Bolshoi Theatre* (J. Lawson); *Economic and Philosophic MSS of 1844 by Karl Marx* (Clemens Dutt).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REGULAR HABITS

There is one sure thing—press Lords may have immense financial resources and great circulation machines, but in time of trouble they command not an ounce of the loyalty, devotion and hard work which readers give us. We shall need every bit now. July printing problems forced us to cut supplies and halt our circulation campaign. Cuts are easily made. Replacing lost orders is a far harder task, especially with the holiday seasonal drop. Help to prevent holiday losses by campaigning for orders of this number and to win new regular readers.

Up to July we had achieved no small success in our campaign with sales efforts around particular articles. Our thanks to those who responded to our appeal for sellers on The March for Life, not least to the young people who took thirty copies for sale there.

What pleases us most, because this is what we are after, is that these temporary achievements lead to permanent improvement. Thus, sales during the Scottish miners' lobby, orders for particular numbers and our manager's visit to Scotland led to regular monthly orders from six more Scottish miners' union branches. Extra sales in Surrey, with the John Foster article, have brought regular orders from two engineering union branches. Amongst those responding to our July appeal was a Sussex reader, who added one more each month by taking out an extra subscription, aiming to pass it round to gain new readers.

In a lively way Solly Kaye writes on local councils and the work of Labour and Communist councillors. We should like to see special efforts to get this into the hands of active ward Labour Party workers and local councillors. Joe Sack's interesting comments on employment problems in Crawley and the spirited fight-back of the workers there, merits very wide sales in that and other new towns.

We can make special arrangements to let you have campaigning copies. We ask you to do one of two things—both, if you can. 1. Take campaign copies for sales to people concerned with the problems raised in particular articles. 2. Take an extra copy to win a new regular reader in August. We can supply if need be a specimen copy or a midget Labour Monthly. Fill in the form on the back page of cover and let us have quickly all the help we so urgently need.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Crafton Press Ltd., Leicester, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

C'Etait Ainsi . . . (Souvenirs)
Fernand Grenier
Editions Sociales, Paris, April, 1959
228 pp. 500 Frs.

THIS is a personal narrative by the well-known Communist, long deputy for the industrial constituency of Saint Denis, of his life from 1940 to 1944.

He tells his story in four main phases; life in various internment camps until his escape in June, 1941; his experiences in underground work in Paris from that date until the end of 1942; his work in London from January to October, 1943; and finally his work in Algiers from then until the following summer, in the course of which it may be remembered that he became Minister for Air, as the nominee of his Party, in the provisional government of France established in that city.

The book is far more than just a story of a leading Communist doing important work under difficulties, or of the discipline and courage of Communists and the strength that they gain from organised collective work and discussion. It is something much more important; a fully-documented account of the efforts of the Party (through Grenier himself, their delegate for that purpose), to secure from the French government in London (and from the British Government too) the arms, money, and other facilities required to support the powerful Resistance movement of France, capable both of dealing heavy blows at the enemy and of raising the morale of the whole population, and of the persistent and treasonable sabotage of all these efforts by the French government, especially by de Gaulle and his (then and now) assistant, Soustelle. It is more, too; for it tells the story of the even cruder and less excusable sabotage of parallel efforts in the fourth phase, at Algiers, by de Gaulle's provisional government there.

What makes the book a work of first-class importance is that it gives just one more terrible example of the readiness of anti-Communists to sacrifice their own country and their own fellow-countrymen (indeed, to sacrifice anything on earth except their own skins and their own property) to their anti-Communistic obsessions. Grenier mildly describes this anti-Communism as 'une triste maladie,' as if the capitalist world were no more than one great sanatorium for melancholia; but his book makes it clear that the said world consists mainly of traitors' clubs.

D. N. PRITT, Q.C.

Soviet Medicine in the Fight Against Mental Disease
L. Rokhlin, translated by David Myshne
Lawrence & Wishart. 168 pp. 5s.

IN 1957 the total number of beds in Soviet mental hospitals was 115,430; the figure for England and Wales, including mental deficiency hospitals, was 215,000 for a population of less than a quarter the size. The figures are probably not strictly comparable, and overcrowding and long waiting lists no doubt exist in both countries. Nevertheless, there must also be a deep difference in approach and outlook which is not yet fully appreciated or defined. Mental disease and psychology command increasing attention in capitalist countries. A spate of publicity in the form of popular and scientific publications, films of 'snake-pit' hospitals, radio and television broadcasts has led to a more enlightened attitude to disease and treatment, although much more could and should be done to build new hospitals, staff them adequately and extend research. On the other hand, stress on introspection and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pre-occupation with purely psychological matters is not entirely healthy and tends to distract attention from the major causes of anxiety and breakdown in capitalist society—economic distress, insecurity and hostility between men engendered by competition. Unfounded views ascribing paramount importance to inborn instincts and drives, not only in the production of mental disease but normal human relations in the home, school and factory, are widely accepted.

The book gives the Soviet view on psychiatry. It outlines its history, giving due credit to such pioneers as Pinel in France and Conolly and Maudsley in this country for humanizing the treatment of the insane. It then proceeds to deal at greater length with the history of Russian psychiatry, which acquired an early reputation for its humanity. The names of some of the leading Russian psychiatrists are well known abroad. Korsakov and Bekhterev are mentioned, for example, in most textbooks, but many other useful contributions were being overlooked in the past. Great importance is attached in Russia to the work of I. P. Pavlov, who laid the foundations of the science of higher nervous activity by his method of conditioned reflexes. Towards the end of his life Pavlov became increasingly interested in trying to apply personally the newly discovered physiological principles to the study of mental disorder in man. He gave a tentative interpretation in terms of physiological processes to many hitherto obscure mental states and derangements, and was able to produce somewhat similar conditions experimentally in animals. The author describes this work. Many western specialists would not agree that these Pavlovian interpretations are more than interesting analogies and possible models which require further confirmation. The book treats them as established facts, and in doing so oversimplifies the issue. Nevertheless there is a world of difference between the groping but scientific way of Pavlov and the wild speculations that often pass for science in the West. In dealing with the causes of mental illness the author rightly stresses the role of preventible environmental factors and his approach to treatment is optimistic throughout. The need for preventive measures is emphasised. Treatment of established disease is very similar to that in this country. However, severe operations damaging the brain irreversibly, such as leucotomy, are not performed. Insulin treatment of depression and schizophrenia, which is going out of fashion here, is still used. More importance is given to various forms of sleep and work therapy. Psychotherapy is practised, but it is not psycho-analytically orientated. As in this country, there is a steady trend towards abolishing all excessive restraint, but the Russians have probably greater success in retaining the mentally ill within the community. Another major difference is staffing of mental hospitals. The figures quoted, one psychiatrist to 28, one qualified nurse to 6 and one orderly to 3 patients, are almost incredible and will be greatly envied by foreign workers. In the last chapter the author describes the work of the main centres of the mental health service; the psychiatric dispensaries, workshops for out-patients, hospitals for short-term and for long-term cases ('psychiatric colonies'), as well as the provision made for mentally ill children. Although the book is very good value for money, the production is rather careless. The text is marred by many mis-translations and misprints. It is also a matter of opinion whether it is not too technical for the general public and not technical enough for the specialist. Finally, the title should have been toned down to conform with current English usage.

L. CROME

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(continued from page II of cover)

general printing is £460 a year and in newspapers, £550.

There have been features in this dispute which put it in a class by itself. First, the vigour and inventiveness of the rank-and-file members in keeping employers and police anxiously wondering daily where the demonstrators would turn up next. It had a healthy effect on would-be strikebreakers. Also on victimised weaker brethren, such as journalists, who got sacked like any normal mortal, when it came to the pinch. And also on fellow trade unionists in other industries, who always take lively interest in ways and means of campaigning in support of demands. In Top Circles, on the other hand, there were signs of intense nervousness at these demonstrations. Printers have been known to make their own contribution to the fight for the freedom of the press before now, and in a way which struck the other side gibbering with terror. In 1919 printers threatened to stop lying posters against the railwaymen on strike; on May 2, 1926, printers refused to produce the *Daily Mail* for its remarks on the miners and the T.U.C.; on June 18, 1959, branches of NATSOPA held up ink supplies to the *News Chronicle* in protest against a leading article. What with this sort of thing and their singing Rule, Britannia as though they meant it, printworkers in the chapels made their presence felt in Downing Street. Another feature was the prompt action of printworkers in West Germany, Holland, Belgium and France to prevent publishers taking work overseas instead of to British firms which had made their peace. The shorter working week is a demand which European trade unionists can well understand—they are all demanding it for themselves. In the 1870's the battle put up for the shorter working week in Britain was closely watched by trade unionists in Europe, who also began to demand what they called 'the English Week.' Perhaps once again the English Week will become the standard of achievement. But when we come to look back, the greatest feature of the printers' struggle will, I think, be found in the impetus to the whole campaign for the 40-hour week in Britain, now claimed in every major industry. Together with the necessary wage demands, a showdown is inevitable. The other side know it. Many more workers now think like the engineer who said to me at the start: 'If the printers lose, there is much less chance of our winning the 40-hour week.'

For us at LABOUR MONTHLY it has been a busy time, too. We had to find another firm, able to produce this issue. Of course, this temporary transfer was done only after consultation with, and approval by, the union branches affected. It meant considerable practical difficulties which could never have been surmounted except with splendid understanding and goodwill all round. That, and our readers' reaction to our July emergency appeal, makes a story for the future. Meanwhile, the June Fund total (see page 342) shows what a crisis existed even before the present time of trouble. But there will be no shortage of August copies, so now is the moment to make up for lost time in winning new readers. See the campaign suggestions on page 366.

ANGELA TUCKETT,

134 Ballard's Lane, London, N.3.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME.....

(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS.....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope. For overseas rates, see page 339) for year's subscription from the..... issue.

(SIGNED).....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3.

Those precious back numbers

We are seeking to add to our stocks of Bound Volumes and single copies for 1939 and preceding years, which are in short supply. It would be most helpful if, before sending them in, you would send us a list of what you have available.

Send to :
The Manager, Labour Monthly, 134 Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

LABOUR RESEARCH

August issue includes :
'Turning Point for Transport'
'East-West Trade'

Monthly 9d; p.a. 11s.

LABOUR RESEARCH DEPARTMENT
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

NATIONAL GUARDIAN

10th Year of Publication

Authoritative voice of the American progressive movement

Edited by JAMES ARONSON

Annual Subscription 35s.

ORDER FROM COLLET'S
40 GREAT RUSSELL STREET, W.C.1

OUR CIRCULATION CAMPAIGN

Send to : Angela Tuckett, Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

Please send me .....campaign copies of the August number for sale to

.....

I will volunteer to get.....regular reader(s) in August.

Please send.....specimen copies.....midget **Labour Monthly.**

Name.....

Address.....

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED